

A NILPOTENT IP POLYNOMIAL MULTIPLE RECURRENCE THEOREM

PAVEL ZORIN-KRANICH

ABSTRACT. We generalize the IP-polynomial Szemerédi theorem due to Bergelson and McCutcheon and the nilpotent Szemerédi theorem due to Leibman. Important tools in our proof include a generalization of Leibman’s result that polynomial mappings into a nilpotent group form a group and a multiparameter nilpotent Hales-Jewett theorem.

1. INTRODUCTION

Furstenberg’s ergodic theoretic proof [Fur77] of Szemerédi’s theorem on arithmetic progressions [Sze75] has led to various generalizations of the latter. Recall that Furstenberg’s original multiple recurrence theorem provides a syndetic set of return times. The IP recurrence theorem of Furstenberg and Katznelson [FK85], among other things, improves this to an IP^* set. The idea to consider the limit behavior of a multicorrelation sequence not along a Følner sequence but along an IP-ring has proved to be very fruitful and allowed them to obtain the density Hales-Jewett theorem [FK91].

In a different direction, Bergelson and Leibman [BL96] proved a polynomial multiple recurrence theorem that has later been extended from commutative to nilpotent groups of transformations by Leibman [Lei98]. Many of the additional difficulties involved in this extension were algebraic in nature and have led Leibman to establish a general theory of polynomial mappings into nilpotent groups [Lei02]. An important aspect of the proofs of these polynomial recurrence theorems, being present in all later extensions including the present article, is that the induction process involves “multiparameter” recurrence even if one is ultimately only interested in the “one-parameter” case.

More recently an effort has been undertaken to combine these two directions. Building on their earlier joint work with Furstenberg [BFM96], Bergelson and McCutcheon [BM00] obtained results that allowed to replace the syndetic set of return times in the polynomial multiple recurrence theorem by an IP^* -set but did not fully encompass the IP multiple recurrence theorem of Furstenberg and Katznelson. This has been amended by Bergelson, Håland Knutson and McCutcheon for single recurrence [BHKM06] and McCutcheon for multiple recurrence [McC05] (the results of the latter paper also provide multiple recurrence along certain generalized polynomials).

In this article we continue this line of investigation. Our main result, Theorem 5.32, generalizes McCutcheon’s IP polynomial multiple recurrence theorem to the nilpotent setting. Its significance is best illustrated by the following generalization of Leibman’s nilpotent multiple recurrence theorem (here and throughout the article group actions on topological spaces and measure spaces are on the right and on function spaces on the left.).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $T_1, \dots, T_t$ be invertible measure-preserving transformations on a probability space $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ that generate a nilpotent group. Then for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ with*

Date: March 6, 2013.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 37A30, secondary 05D10 37B20.

Key words and phrases. ergodic Ramsey theory; IP-sets; nilpotent Hales-Jewett theorem; nilpotent Szemerédi theorem.

$\mu(A) > 0$, any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and any polynomials $p_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_m]$, $i = 1, \dots, t$, $j = 1, \dots, s$, that vanish at 0 the set

$$\left\{ \vec{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^m : \mu \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^s A \left(\prod_{i=1}^t T_i^{p_{i,j}(\vec{n})} \right)^{-1} \right) > 0 \right\}$$

is IP^* in $\mathbb{Z}^m$.

While the proof strategy is basically the same as in the article of Bergelson and McCutcheon [BM00] there are several new challenges at the technical level. Let us give a brief outline. In Section 2 we set up the algebraic framework: IP-polynomials in one and several variables with values in a nilpotent group. In Section 3 we prove a stronger version of the nilpotent Hales-Jewett theorem due to Bergelson and Leibman (Theorem 3.3). This allows us to deduce a multiparameter version (Theorem 3.6). That version is ultimately applied to polynomial-valued polynomials mappings, see Corollary 3.8. In Section 4 we define the nilpotent analogue of FVIP systems and prove that unitary representations of such systems IP-converge to projections, see Theorem 4.2 (this suffices to obtain single recurrence). Here we use the concept of Hirsch length that generalizes the notion of the rank of a free $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. Finally, in Section 5 we use these preliminary results to prove the multiple recurrence theorem 5.26. The a priori restriction to regular measure spaces and certain countable groups of polynomials in several variables can be easily removed, and this yields our main result.

2. POLYNOMIAL MAPPINGS

In this section we set up the algebraic framework for dealing with IP-polynomials in several variables with values in a nilpotent group.

We begin with a generalization of Leibman's result that polynomial mappings into a nilpotent group form a group under pointwise operations [Lei02, Proposition 3.7 and erratum]. Following an idea from the proof of that result by Green and Tao [GT12, Proposition 6.5] we encode the information that is contained in Leibman's vector degree in a prefiltration indexed by $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, \dots\}$ (see [GTZ10, Appendix B] for related results regarding prefiltrations indexed by more general partially ordered semigroups).

A *prefiltration* $G_\bullet$ is a sequence of nested groups

$$(2.1) \quad G_0 \geq G_1 \geq G_2 \geq \dots \quad \text{such that} \quad [G_i, G_j] \subset G_{i+j} \quad \text{for every } i, j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

A *filtration* (on a group G) is a prefiltration in which $G_0 = G_1$ (and $G_0 = G$). We will frequently write G instead of G_0 . Conversely, most groups G that we consider in this article are provided with a prefiltration $G_\bullet$ with $G_0 = G$. A group may admit several prefiltrations, and we usually fix one of them even if we do not refer to it explicitly.

A prefiltration is said to have *length* $d \in \mathbb{N}$ if G_{d+1} is the trivial group and length $-\infty$ if G_0 is the trivial group. Arithmetic for lengths is defined in the same way as conventionally done for degrees of polynomials, i.e. $d - t = -\infty$ if $d < t$.

Let $G_\bullet$ be a prefiltration of length d and $t \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote by $G_{\bullet+t}$ the prefiltration of length $d - t$ given by $(G_{\bullet+t})_i = G_{i+t}$ and by $G_{\bullet/t}$ the prefiltration of length $\min(d, t)$ given by $G_{i/t} = G_i / G_t$ (this is understood to be the trivial group for $i \geq t$; note that G_t is normal in each G_i for $i \leq t$ by (2.1)). These two operations on prefiltrations can be combined: we denote by $G_{\bullet/t+s}$ the prefiltration given by $G_{i/t+s} = G_{i+s} / G_t$, it can be obtained applying first the operation $/t$ and then the operation $+s$ (hence the notation).

If G is a nilpotent group then the lower central series is a filtration. More generally, if $G_1 \leq G_0$ is a normal subgroup then $G_{i+1} = [G_i, G_1]$ defines a prefiltration (that has finite length if and only if G_1 is nilpotent). If $G_\bullet$ is a prefiltration and $\vec{d} = (d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$ is

a superadditive sequence (i.e. $d_{i+j} \geq d_i + d_j$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$; by convention $d_{-1} = -\infty$) then $G_{\bullet}^{\bar{d}}$, defined by

$$(2.2) \quad G_i^{\bar{d}} = G_j \quad \text{whenever} \quad d_{j-1} < i \leq d_j,$$

is again a prefiltration.

We define $G_{\bullet}$ -polynomial maps by induction on the length of the prefiltration.

Definition 2.3. Let Γ be any set and $\mathcal{T}$ be a set of partially defined maps $T : \Gamma \supset \text{dom}(T) \rightarrow \Gamma$. Let $G_{\bullet}$ be a prefiltration of length $d \in \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbb{N}$. A map $g : \Gamma \rightarrow G_0$ is called $G_{\bullet}$ -polynomial (w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$) if either $d = -\infty$ (so that g identically equals the identity) or for every $T \in \mathcal{T}$ there exists a $G_{\bullet+1}$ -polynomial map $D_T g$ such that

$$(2.4) \quad D_T g = g^{-1} T g := g^{-1}(g \circ T) \quad \text{on} \quad \text{dom } T.$$

We write $P(\Gamma, G_{\bullet})$ for the set of $G_{\bullet}$ -polynomial maps, usually suppressing any reference to the set of maps $\mathcal{T}$ that will remain fixed for most of the article.

Informally, a map $g : \Gamma \rightarrow G_0$ is polynomial if every discrete derivative $D_T g$ is polynomial “of lower degree” (the “degree” of a $G_{\bullet}$ -polynomial would be the length of the prefiltration $G_{\bullet}$, but we prefer not to use this notion since it is necessary to keep track of the prefiltration $G_{\bullet}$ anyway). The connection with Leibman’s notion of vector degree is provided by (2.2): a map has vector degree $\bar{d}$ w.r.t. a prefiltration $G_{\bullet}$ if and only if it is $G_{\bullet}^{\bar{d}}$ -polynomial.

Note that if g is $G_{\bullet}$ -polynomial then gG_t is $G_{\bullet/t}$ -polynomial for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$ (but not conversely). We abuse the notation by saying that g is $G_{\bullet/t}$ -polynomial if gG_t is $G_{\bullet/t}$ -polynomial. In assertions that hold for all $T \in \mathcal{T}$ we omit the subscript in D_T .

The next theorem is the basic result about $G_{\bullet}$ -polynomials.

Theorem 2.5. *For every prefiltration $G_{\bullet}$ of length $d \in \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ the following holds.*

- (1) *Let $t_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $g_i : \Gamma \rightarrow G$ be maps such that g_i is $G_{\bullet/(d+1-t_{1-i})+t_i}$ -polynomial for $i = 0, 1$. Then the commutator $[g_0, g_1]$ is $G_{\bullet+t_0+t_1}$ -polynomial.*
- (2) *Let $g_0, g_1 : \Gamma \rightarrow G$ be $G_{\bullet}$ -polynomial maps. Then the product $g_0 g_1$ is also $G_{\bullet}$ -polynomial.*
- (3) *Let $g : \Gamma \rightarrow G$ be a $G_{\bullet}$ -polynomial map. Then its pointwise inverse g^{-1} is also $G_{\bullet}$ -polynomial.*

Proof. We use induction on d . If $d = -\infty$ then the group G_0 is trivial and all assertions hold trivially. Let $d \geq 0$ and assume that the assertion holds for all smaller values of d .

We prove part (1) using descending induction on $t = t_0 + t_1$. We clearly have $[g_0, g_1] \subset G_t$. If $t \geq d + 1$ there is nothing left to show. Otherwise it remains to show that $D[g_0, g_1]$ is $G_{\bullet+t+1}$ -polynomial. For this end use the commutator identity

$$(2.6) \quad D[g_0, g_1] = [g_0, Dg_1] \cdot [[g_0, Dg_1], [g_0, g_1]] \\ \cdot [[g_0, g_1], Dg_1] \cdot [[g_0, g_1 Dg_1], Dg_0] \cdot [Dg_0, g_1 Dg_1].$$

We will show that the second to last term is $G_{\bullet+t+1}$ -polynomial, the argument for the other terms is similar. Note that Dg_0 is $G_{\bullet/(d+1-t_1)+t_0+1}$ -polynomial. By inner induction hypothesis it suffices to show that $[g_0, g_1 Dg_1]$ is $G_{\bullet/(d-t_0)+t_1}$ -polynomial. But the prefiltration $G_{\bullet/(d-t_0)}$ has smaller length than $G_{\bullet}$, and by the outer induction hypothesis we can conclude that $g_1 Dg_1$ is $G_{\bullet/(d-t_0)+t_1}$ -polynomial. Moreover g_0 is clearly $G_{\bullet/(d-t_0-t_1)}$ -polynomial, and by the outer induction hypothesis their commutator is $G_{\bullet/(d-t_0)+t_1}$ -polynomial again.

Provided that each multiplicand in (2.6) is $G_{\bullet+t+1}$ -polynomial we can conclude that $D[g_0, g_1]$ is $G_{\bullet+t+1}$ -polynomial by the outer induction hypothesis.

Part (2) follows immediately by the Leibniz rule

$$(2.7) \quad D(g_0 g_1) = Dg_0 [Dg_0, g_1] Dg_1$$

from (1) with $t_0 = 1$, $t_1 = 0$ and the induction hypothesis.

To prove part (3) notice that

$$(2.8) \quad D(g^{-1}) = g(Dg)^{-1}g^{-1} = [g^{-1}, Dg](Dg)^{-1}.$$

By the induction hypothesis the map g^{-1} is $G_{\bullet/d}$ -polynomial, the map Dg is $G_{\bullet+1}$ -polynomial and the map $(Dg)^{-1}$ is $G_{\bullet+1}$ -polynomial. Thus also $D(g^{-1})$ is $G_{\bullet+1}$ -polynomial by (1) and the induction hypothesis. $\square$

Discarding some technical information that was necessary for the inductive proof we can write the above theorem succinctly as follows.

Corollary 2.9. *Let $G_\bullet$ be a prefiltration of length d . Then the set $P(\Gamma, G_\bullet)$ of $G_\bullet$ -polynomials on Γ is a group under pointwise operations and admits a canonical prefiltration of length d given by*

$$P(\Gamma, G_\bullet) \geq P(\Gamma, G_{\bullet+1}) \geq \cdots \geq P(\Gamma, G_{\bullet+d+1}).$$

Clearly every subgroup $F \leq P(\Gamma, G_\bullet)$ admits a canonical prefiltration $F_\bullet$ given by

$$(2.10) \quad F_i = F \cap P(\Gamma, G_{\bullet+i}).$$

Remark 2.11. If Γ is a group and

$$(2.12) \quad \mathcal{T} = \{T_b : n \mapsto nb, \text{dom}(T_b) = \Gamma, \text{ where } b \in \Gamma\}$$

we recover [Lei02, Proposition 3.7].

Example 2.13. If Γ is a group and

$$(2.14) \quad \mathcal{T} = \{T_{a,b} : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma, n \mapsto anb, \text{ where } a, b \in \Gamma\}$$

then every group homomorphism $g : \Gamma \rightarrow G_1$ is polynomial. In particular, every homomorphism to a nilpotent group is polynomial with respect to the lower central series.

This can be seen by induction on the length d of the prefiltration $G_\bullet$ as follows. If $d = -\infty$ there is nothing to show. If $d \geq 0$ write

$$(2.15) \quad D_{T_{a,b}}g(n) = g(n)^{-1}g(anb) = [g(n), g(a)^{-1}]g(ab).$$

By the induction hypothesis gG_d is $G_{\bullet/d}$ -polynomial and the constant maps $g(a)^{-1}$, $g(ab)$ are $G_{\bullet+1}$ -polynomial since they take values in G_1 . Hence $D_{T_{a,b}}g$ is $G_{\bullet+1}$ -polynomial by Theorem 2.5.

We will encounter further concrete examples of polynomials in Proposition 2.24 and Lemma 4.22.

IP-polynomials. In this article we are interested in the case $\Gamma = \mathcal{F}_0$, where $\mathcal{F}_0$ is the partial semigroup¹ of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ with the operation $\alpha * \beta = \alpha \cup \beta$ that is only defined if α and β are disjoint. It is partially ordered by $\alpha < \beta$ if and only if $\max \alpha < \min \beta$ (note that in particular $\emptyset < \alpha$ and $\alpha < \emptyset$ for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_0$).

The set $\mathcal{T}$ is then given by

$$(2.16) \quad \mathcal{T} = \{T_\alpha : \beta \mapsto \alpha * \beta, \text{dom}(T_\alpha) = \{\beta : \alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset\}, \text{ where } \alpha \in \Gamma\}.$$

If $T = T_\alpha$ then we also write D_α instead of D_{T_α} . We write $P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_\bullet)$ for the subgroup of polynomials that vanish at $\emptyset$. For every $g \in P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_\bullet)$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{F}_0$ we have

$$(2.17) \quad g(\beta) = g(\emptyset)D_\beta g(\emptyset) \in G_1.$$

Therefore the symmetric derivative $\tilde{D}$, defined by

$$(2.18) \quad \tilde{D}_\beta g(\alpha) = D_\beta g(\alpha)g(\beta)^{-1} = g(\alpha)^{-1}g(\alpha \cup \beta)g(\beta)^{-1},$$

¹A partial semigroup [BBH94] is a set Γ together with a partially defined operation $*$: $\Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ that is associative in the sense that $(a * b) * c = a * (b * c)$ whenever both sides are defined.

maps $P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)$ into $P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_{\bullet+1})$. Moreover $P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)$ admits the canonical prefiltration of length $d - 1$ given by

$$P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet) \geq P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_{\bullet+1}) \geq \cdots \geq P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_{\bullet+d}).$$

The group $P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)$ can also be alternatively characterized by $P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet) = \{1_G\}$ if $d = -\infty, 0$ and

$$g \in P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet) \iff g : \mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow G_1 \text{ and } \forall \beta \check{D}_\beta g \in P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_{\bullet+1}).$$

Polynomials in several variables. As we have already mentioned in the introduction, the inductive procedure that has been so far utilized in all polynomial extensions of Szemerédi's theorem inherently relies on polynomials in several variables. We find it more convenient to define polynomials of m variables not on $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset^m$, but rather on the subset $(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset^m)_< \subset \mathcal{F}_\emptyset^m$ that consists of ordered tuples, i.e.

$$(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset^m)_< = \{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathcal{F}_\emptyset^m : \alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_m\}.$$

Analogously, $(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset)_<^\omega$ is the set of infinite increasing sequences in $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset$. We will frequently denote elements of $(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset^m)_<$ or $(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset)_<^\omega$ by $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots)$.

Definition 2.19. Let $G_\bullet$ be a prefiltration and $F \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)$ a subgroup. We define the set $F^{\otimes m}$ of polynomial expressions in m variables by induction on m as follows. We set $F^{\otimes 0} = \{1_G\}$ and we let $F^{\otimes m+1}$ be the set of functions $g : (\mathcal{F}_\emptyset^{m+1})_< \rightarrow G_0$ such that

$$g(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m+1}) = W^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m}(\alpha_{m+1})S(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m),$$

where $S \in F^{\otimes m}$ and $W^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m} \in F$ for every $\alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_m$.

Note that $F^{\otimes 1} = F$.

Lemma 2.20. Suppose that F is invariant under conjugation by constant functions. Then, for each m , the set $F^{\otimes m}$ is a group under pointwise operations and admits a canonical prefiltration given by $(F^{\otimes m})_i = (F_i)^{\otimes m}$.

If $K \leq F$ is a subgroup that is invariant under conjugation by constant functions then $K^{\otimes m} \leq F^{\otimes m}$ is also a subgroup.

Proof. We use induction on m . For $m = 0$ there is nothing to show. Let

$$R_j \in (F_{t_j})^{\otimes m+1} : (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m+1}) \mapsto W_j^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m}(\alpha_{m+1})S_j(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m), \quad j = 0, 1$$

be polynomial expressions in $m + 1$ variables. Suppressing the variables $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ we have

$$R_0 R_1^{-1}(\alpha_{m+1}) = W_0(\alpha_{m+1}) \underbrace{(S_0 S_1^{-1} W_1^{-1} S_1 S_0^{-1})}_{\in F}(\alpha_{m+1}) S_0 S_1^{-1},$$

so that $R_0 R_1^{-1} \in F^{\otimes m+1}$. Hence $F^{\otimes m+1}$ is a group.

In order to show that $(F_\bullet)^{\otimes m+1}$ is indeed a prefiltration we have to verify that

$$[R_0, R_1] = [W_0 S_0, W_1 S_1] \in (F_{t_0+t_1})^{m+1}.$$

This follows from the identity

$$\begin{aligned} [xy, uv] &= [x, u][x, v][[x, v], [x, u]][[x, u], v] \\ &\quad \cdot [[x, v][x, u][[x, u], v], y] \\ &\quad \cdot [y, v], [y, u][[y, u], v]. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $K^{\otimes m} \leq F^{\otimes m}$ is a subgroup provided that both sets are groups. $\square$

For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a canonical embedding $F^{\otimes m} \leq F^{\otimes m+1}$ that forgets the last variable. Thus we can talk about

$$F^{\otimes \omega} := \text{inj} \lim_{m \in \mathbb{N}} F^{\otimes m} = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} F^{\otimes m},$$

this is a group of maps defined on $(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset)_<^\omega$ with prefiltration $(F^{\otimes \omega})_i = (F_i)^{\otimes \omega}$.

Polynomial-valued polynomials.

Definition 2.21. Let $G_\bullet$ be a filtration of length d . A *VIP group* is a subgroup $F \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)$ that is closed under conjugation by constant functions and under $\tilde{D}$ in the sense that for every $g \in F$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_\emptyset$ the symmetric derivative $\tilde{D}_\alpha g$ lies in F_1 (defined in (2.10)).

As an example, the group $P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)$ itself is VIP.

Proposition 2.22. Let $F \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)$ be a VIP group. Then for every $g \in F^{\otimes m}$ the substitution map

$$(2.23) \quad h : \vec{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m) \in (\mathcal{F}_\emptyset)_{<}^m \mapsto (g[\vec{\beta}] : \vec{\alpha} \in (\mathcal{F}_\emptyset)_{<}^\omega \mapsto g(\cup_{i \in \beta_1} \alpha_i, \dots, \cup_{i \in \beta_m} \alpha_i))$$

lies in $P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, F^{\otimes \omega})^{\otimes m}$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on m . In case $m = 0$ there is nothing to show, so suppose that the assertion is known for m and consider $g \in F^{\otimes m+1}$. By definition we have

$$g(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m+1}) = W^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m}(\alpha_{m+1})S(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$$

and

$$h(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{m+1})(\vec{\alpha}) = W^{\cup_{i \in \beta_1} \alpha_i, \dots, \cup_{i \in \beta_m} \alpha_i}[\beta_{m+1}](\vec{\alpha})S[\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m](\vec{\alpha}).$$

In view of the induction hypothesis it remains to verify that the map

$$\tilde{h} : \beta \mapsto (\vec{\alpha} \mapsto W^{\cup_{i \in \beta_1} \alpha_i, \dots, \cup_{i \in \beta_m} \alpha_i}[\beta](\vec{\alpha})), \quad \beta > \beta_m > \dots > \beta_1$$

is in $P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, F^{\otimes \omega})$. The fact that $\tilde{h}(\beta) \in F^{\otimes \omega}$ for all β follows by induction on $|\beta|$ using the identity

$$\begin{aligned} W^{\cup_{i \in \beta_1} \alpha_i, \dots, \cup_{i \in \beta_m} \alpha_i}[\beta \cup \{b\}](\vec{\alpha}) = \\ W^{\cup_{i \in \beta_1} \alpha_i, \dots, \cup_{i \in \beta_m} \alpha_i}(\alpha_b) \tilde{D}_{\cup_{i \in \beta} \alpha_i} W^{\cup_{i \in \beta_1} \alpha_i, \dots, \cup_{i \in \beta_m} \alpha_i}(\alpha_b) W^{\cup_{i \in \beta_1} \alpha_i, \dots, \cup_{i \in \beta_m} \alpha_i}[\beta](\vec{\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

that holds whenever $b > \beta > \beta_m > \dots > \beta_1$. In order to see that $\tilde{h}$ is polynomial in β observe that

$$\tilde{D}_\gamma \tilde{h}(\beta) : \vec{\alpha} \mapsto \tilde{D}_{\cup_{i \in \gamma} \alpha_i} W^{\cup_{i \in \beta_1} \alpha_i, \dots, \cup_{i \in \beta_m} \alpha_i}(\cup_{i \in \beta} \alpha_i), \quad \beta > \gamma > \beta_m > \dots > \beta_1. \quad \square$$

Monomial mappings. In this section we verify that monomial mappings into nilpotent groups in the sense of Bergelson and Leibman [BL03, §1.3] are polynomial in the sense of Definition 2.3.

For a sequence of finite sets $R = (R_0, R_1, \dots)$ only finitely many of which are non-empty and a set α write

$$R[\alpha] := \alpha^0 \times R_0 \uplus \alpha^1 \times R_1 \uplus \dots$$

Here the symbol $\uplus$ denotes disjoint union and α^i are powers of the set α (note that α^0 consists of one element, the empty tuple).

Proposition 2.24. Let $G_\bullet$ be a prefiltration of length d and $N \subset \mathbb{N}$ any subset. Let $g_\bullet : R[N] \rightarrow G$, $x \mapsto g_x$ be a mapping such that $g_\bullet(N^i \times R_i) \subset G_i$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\prec$ be any linear ordering on $R[N]$. Then the map

$$g : \mathcal{F}(N) \rightarrow G, \quad \alpha \mapsto \prod_{j \in R[\alpha]}^{\prec} g_j$$

is $G_\bullet$ -polynomial on the partial semigroup $\mathcal{F}(N)$.

Proof. We induct on the length of the prefiltration $G_\bullet$. If $d = -\infty$ then there is nothing to prove. Otherwise let $\beta \in \mathcal{F}(N)$. We have to show that $D_\beta g$ is $G_{\bullet+1}$ -polynomial.

Let $B \subset R[N]$ be a finite set and $A \subset B$. By induction on the length of an initial segment of A (that proceeds by pulling the terms g_j , $j \in A$, out of the double product one by one, leaving commutators behind) we see that

$$(2.25) \quad \prod_{j \in B}^{\prec} g_j = \prod_{j \in A}^{\prec} g_j \prod_{j \in B \setminus A}^{\prec} \prod_{k \in A^{\leq d}}^{\succ\text{-lexicographic}} g_{j,k},$$

where $A^{\leq d}$ is the set of all tuples of elements of A with at most d coordinates in N and

$$g_{j,\emptyset} = g_j, \quad g_{j,(k_0, \dots, k_i)} = \begin{cases} [g_{j,(k_0, \dots, k_{i-1})}, g_{k_i}] & \text{if } j \prec k_0 \prec \dots \prec k_i, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(N)$ be disjoint from β . Applying (2.25) with $A := R[\alpha]$ and $B := R[\alpha \cup \beta]$ we obtain

$$D_\beta g(\alpha) = \prod_{j \in R[\alpha \cup \beta] \setminus R[\alpha]}^{\prec} \prod_{k \in R[\alpha]^{\leq d}}^{\succ\text{-lexicographic}} g_{j,k},$$

where $g_{j,(k_0, \dots, k_i)} \in G_{l+l_0+\dots+l_i}$ provided that $j \in \alpha^l \times R_l$ and $k_0 \in \alpha^{l_0} \times R_{l_0}, \dots, k_i \in \alpha^{l_i} \times R_{l_i}$.

The double product can be rewritten as $\prod_{l \in S[\alpha]}^{\prec'} h_l$ for some sequence of finite sets S , an ordering $\prec'$ on $S[N']$, where $N' = N \setminus \beta$, and $h_\bullet : S[N'] \rightarrow G$. The sequence of sets S is obtained by the requirement

$$(R[\alpha \cup \beta] \setminus R[\alpha]) \times R[\alpha]^{\leq d} = S[\alpha]$$

for every $\alpha \subset N'$. The lexicographic ordering on $(R[N] \setminus R[N']) \times R[N']^{\leq d}$ induces an ordering $\prec'$ on $S[N']$. Define $h_z = g_{j,k}$ if (j,k) corresponds to $z \in S[N']$.

By construction we have $h_\bullet((N')^i \times S_i) \subset G_{i+1}$ since each element of $R[N] \setminus R[N']$ has at least one coordinate in N but not N' . Thus $D_\beta g$ is $G_{\bullet+1}$ -polynomial by the induction hypothesis. $\square$

Corollary 2.26. *Let G be a nilpotent group with lower central series*

$$G = G_0 = G_1 \geq \dots \geq G_s \geq G_{s+1} = \{1_G\},$$

let $g_\bullet : N^d \rightarrow G$ be an arbitrary mapping and $\prec$ be any linear ordering on N^d . Then the map

$$g : \mathcal{F}(N) \rightarrow G, \quad \alpha \mapsto \prod_{j \in \alpha^d}^{\prec} g_j$$

is polynomial on the partial semigroup $\mathcal{F}(N)$ with respect to the filtration

$$(2.27) \quad G_0 \geq \underbrace{G_1 \geq \dots \geq G_1}_{d \text{ times}} \geq \dots \geq \underbrace{G_s \geq \dots \geq G_s}_{d \text{ times}} \geq G_{s+1}.$$

3. NILPOTENT HALES-JEWETT

In this section we refine the nilpotent Hales-Jewett theorem due to Bergelson and Leibman [BL03, Theorem 0.19] using the induction scheme from [BL99, Theorem 3.4]. This refinement enables us to deduce a *multidimensional* nilpotent Hales-Jewett theorem that is required in the proof of our measure-theoretical recurrence result.

PET induction. First we describe the PET (polynomial exhaustion technique) induction scheme [Ber87]. For a polynomial $g \in P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_\bullet)$ define its *level* $l(g)$ as the greatest integer l such that $g \in P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_{\bullet+l})$. We define an equivalence relation on the set of non-zero $G_\bullet$ -polynomials by $g \sim h$ if and only if $l(g) = l(h) < l(g^{-1}h)$. Transitivity and symmetry of $\sim$ follow from Theorem 2.5.

Definition 3.1. A *system* is a finite subset $A \subset P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_\bullet)$. The *weight vector* of a system A is the function

$$l \mapsto \text{the number of equivalence classes modulo } \sim \text{ of level } l \text{ in } A.$$

We order the weight vectors lexicographically.

Proposition 3.2. Let A be a system, $h \in A$ be a mapping of maximal level and $B \subset G_1$, $M \subset \mathcal{F}_0$ be finite sets. Then the weight vector of the system

$$A'' = \{bh^{-1}g\tilde{D}_\alpha g b^{-1}, \quad g \in A, \alpha \in M, b \in B\} \setminus \{1_G\}$$

precedes the weight vector of A .

Proof. We claim first that the weight vector of the system

$$A' = \{h^{-1}g\tilde{D}_\alpha g, \quad \alpha \in M, g \in A\} \setminus \{1_G\}$$

precedes the weight vector of A . Indeed, if $l(g) < l(h)$ then $g \sim h^{-1}g\tilde{D}_\alpha g$. If $l(g) = l(\tilde{g}) = l(h)$ and $g \sim \tilde{g} \not\sim h$ then $h^{-1}g\tilde{D}_\alpha g \sim h^{-1}\tilde{g}\tilde{D}_\alpha \tilde{g}$. Finally if $g \sim h$ then $l(h^{-1}g\tilde{D}_\alpha g) > l(h)$. Thus the weight vector of A' does not differ from the weight of vector of A before the $l(h)$ -th position and is strictly smaller at the $l(h)$ -th position, as required.

We now claim that the weight vector of the system

$$A'' = \{bg b^{-1}, \quad g \in A', b \in B\}$$

coincides with the weight vector of the system A' . Indeed, this follows directly from

$$bg b^{-1} = g[g, b^{-1}] \sim g. \quad \square$$

Nilpotent Hales-Jewett. The following refined version of the nilpotent Hales-Jewett theorem [BL03, Theorem 0.19] does not only guarantee the existence of a “recurrent” point but also allows it to be chosen from a finite subset Sx of any given orbit.

Theorem 3.3 (Nilpotent Hales-Jewett). *Assume that G acts on the right on a compact metric space (X, ρ) by homeomorphisms. For every system A , every $\epsilon > 0$ and every $H \in \mathcal{F}$ there exists $H < N \in \mathcal{F}$ and a finite set $S \subset G$ such that for every $x \in X$ there exist a non-empty $\alpha \subset N$ and $s \in S$ such that $\rho(xsg(\alpha), xs) < \epsilon$ for every $g \in A$.*

The fact that this theorem does indeed generalize [BL03, Theorem 0.19] follows from Corollary 2.26 that substitutes [BL03, §1 and §2]. We refer to [BL03, §5.5] and [BL99, §3.3] for a discussion of the relation to the classical coloring Hales-Jewett theorem. In a nutshell, the coloring Hales-Jewett theorem follows from an analogue of Theorem 3.3 for commutative semigroups of continuous maps on X .

Proof. We use PET-induction on the weight vector $w(A)$. If $w(A)$ vanishes identically then A is the empty system and there is nothing to show. Assume that the conclusion is known for every system whose weight vector precedes $w(A)$. Let $h \in A$ be an element of maximal level, without loss of generality we may assume $h \neq 1_G$. Let k be such that every k -tuple of elements of X contains a pair of elements at distance $< \epsilon/2$.

We define inductively finite sets H_i , finite sets $B_i, \tilde{B}_i \subset G$, systems A_i whose weight vector precedes $w(A)$, positive numbers ϵ_i and finite sets N_i as follows. Begin with $H_0 := H$ and $B_0 = \tilde{B}_0 = \{1_G\}$. The weight vector $w(A_i)$ of the system

$$A_i := \{bh^{-1}g\tilde{D}_m g b^{-1}, \quad m \in N_0 \cup \dots \cup N_{i-1}, b \in B_i\}$$

precedes $w(A)$ by Proposition 3.2. By uniform continuity we can choose ϵ_i such that

$$\rho(x, y) < \epsilon_i \implies \forall \tilde{b} \in \tilde{B}_i \quad \rho(x\tilde{b}, y\tilde{b}) < \frac{\epsilon}{2k}.$$

By the induction hypothesis there exist a finite set $H_i < N_i \in \mathcal{F}$ and a finite set $S_i \subset G$ such that

$$(3.4) \quad \forall x \in X \quad \exists n_i \subset N_i, s_i \in S_i \quad \forall g \in A_i \quad \rho(xs_i g(n_i), xs_i) < \epsilon_i.$$

Finally let $H_{i+1} := H_i \cup N_i$ and

$$B_{i+1} := \{s_i b h(\alpha_i)^{-1}, \quad \alpha_i \subset N_i, s_i \in S_i, b \in B_i\} \subset G,$$

$$\tilde{B}_{i+1} := \{b g(m), \quad g \in A, m \subset N_0 \cup \dots \cup N_i, b \in B_{i+1}\} \subset G.$$

This completes the inductive definition. Now fix $x \in X$. We define a sequence of points y_i by descending induction on i . Begin with $y_k := x$. Assume that y_i has been chosen and choose $n_i \subset N_i$ and $s_i \in S_i$ as in (3.4), then set $y_{i-1} := y_i s_i$.

Finally let $x_0 := y_0 s_0 h(n_0)^{-1}$ and $x_{i+1} := x_i h(n_{i+1})^{-1}$. We claim that for every $g \in A$ and $0 \leq i \leq j \leq k$ we have

$$(3.5) \quad \rho(x_j g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_j), x_i) < \frac{\epsilon}{2k}(j-i).$$

This can be seen by ascending induction on j . Let i be fixed, the claim is trivially true for $j = i$. Assume that the claim holds for $j-1$ and let g be given. Consider

$$b := s_{j-1} \dots s_0 h(n_0)^{-1} \dots h(n_{j-1})^{-1} \in B_j \quad \text{and}$$

$$\tilde{b} := b g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_{j-1}) \in \tilde{B}_j.$$

By choice of n_j and s_j we have

$$\rho(y_j s_j b h(n_j)^{-1} g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_j) g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_{j-1})^{-1} b^{-1}, y_j s_j) < \epsilon_j.$$

By definition of ϵ_j this implies

$$\rho(y_j s_j b h(n_j)^{-1} g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_j) g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_{j-1})^{-1} b^{-1} \tilde{b}, y_j s_j \tilde{b}) < \frac{\epsilon}{2k}.$$

Plugging in the definitions we obtain

$$\rho(x_j g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_j), x_{j-1} g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_{j-1})) < \frac{\epsilon}{2k}.$$

The induction hypothesis then yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho(x_j g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_j), x_i) \\ & \leq \rho(x_j g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_j), x_{j-1} g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_{j-1})) + \rho(x_{j-1} g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_{j-1}), x_i) \\ & < \frac{\epsilon}{2k} + \frac{\epsilon}{2k}((j-1)-i) = \frac{\epsilon}{2k}(j-i) \end{aligned}$$

as required.

Recall now that by definition of k there exist $0 \leq i < j \leq k$ such that $\rho(x_i, x_j) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. By (3.5) we have

$$\rho(x_j g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_j), x_j) \leq \rho(x_j g(n_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup n_j), x_i) + \rho(x_i, x_j) < \epsilon$$

for every $g \in A$. But $x_j = xs$ for some

$$s \in S := S_k \dots S_0 h(\mathcal{F}(N_0))^{-1} \dots h(\mathcal{F}(N_k))^{-1},$$

and we obtain the conclusion with $N = N_0 \cup \dots \cup N_k$ and S as above. $\square$

We remark that [BL99, Theorem 3.4] provides a slightly different set S that can be recovered substituting $y_k := x h(N_k)$ and $y_{i-1} := y_i s_i h(N_{i-1})$ in the above proof and making the corresponding adjustments to the choices of B_i , b and S .

Multidimensional nilpotent Hales-Jewett. Just as in the commutative setting, a multidimensional version of the Hales-Jewett theorem can be deduced from the one-dimensional version.

Theorem 3.6 (Multidimensional nilpotent Hales-Jewett). *Assume that G acts on the right on a compact metric space (X, ρ) by homeomorphisms and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. For every finite set $A \subset P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)^{\otimes m}$, every $\epsilon > 0$ and every $H \in \mathcal{F}$ there exists a finite set $H < N \in \mathcal{F}$ and a finite set $S \subset G$ such that for every $x \in X$ there exists $s \in S$ and non-empty subsets $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_m \subset N$ such that $\rho(xsg(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m), xs) < \epsilon$ for every $g \in A$.*

Proof. We use induction on m . The base case $m = 0$ is trivial. Assume that the conclusion is known for some m , we prove it for $m + 1$.

Let $A \subset P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)^{\otimes m+1}$ and H be given. For convenience we write $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$ and $\alpha = \alpha_{m+1}$. By definition each $g \in A$ can be written in the form

$$g(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m+1}) = g_2^{\vec{\alpha}}(\alpha)g_1(\vec{\alpha})$$

with $g_1 \in P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)^{\otimes m}$ and $g_2^{\vec{\alpha}} \in P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)$.

We apply the induction hypothesis with the system $\{g_1, g \in A\}$ and $\epsilon/2$, thereby obtaining a finite set $N > H$ and a finite set $S \subset G$. We write “ $\vec{\alpha} \subset N$ ” instead of “ $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_m \subset N$ ”.

By uniform continuity there exists ϵ' such that

$$\rho(x, y) < \epsilon' \implies \forall s \in S, \vec{\alpha} \subset N, g \in A \quad \rho(xsg_1(\vec{\alpha}), ysg_1(\vec{\alpha})) < \epsilon/2.$$

We invoke Theorem 3.3 with the system $\{sg_2^{\vec{\alpha}}s^{-1}, s \in S, \vec{\alpha} \subset N, g \in A\}$ and ϵ' , this gives us a finite set $N' > N$ and a finite set $S' \subset G$ with the following property. For every $x \in X$ there exist $s' \in S'$ and $\alpha \subset N'$ such that

$$\forall s \in S, \vec{\alpha} \subset N, g \in A \quad \rho(xs'sg_2^{\vec{\alpha}}(\alpha)s^{-1}, xs') < \epsilon'.$$

By choice of ϵ' this implies

$$\forall s \in S, \vec{\alpha} \subset N, g \in A \quad \rho(xs'sg_2^{\vec{\alpha}}(\alpha)g_1(\vec{\alpha}), xs'sg_1(\vec{\alpha})) < \epsilon/2.$$

By choice of N and S , considering the point xs' , we can find $\vec{\alpha} \subset N$ and $s \in S$ such that

$$\forall g \in A \quad \rho(xs'sg_1(\vec{\alpha}), xs's) < \epsilon/2.$$

Combining the last two inequalities we obtain

$$\forall g \in A \quad \rho(xs'sg(\vec{\alpha}, \alpha), xs's) < \epsilon.$$

This yields the conclusion with finite sets $N \cup N'$ and $S'S$. $\square$

The combinatorial version is derived using the product space construction of Furstenberg and Weiss [FW78].

Corollary 3.7. *Let $G_\bullet$ be a filtration on a countable nilpotent group G , $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A \subset P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)^{\otimes m}$ a finite set and $l \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and finite sets $S, T \subset G$ such that for every l -coloring of T there exist $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_m \subset N$ and $s \in S$ such that the set $\{sg(\vec{\alpha}), g \in A\}$ is monochrome (and in particular contained in T).*

Proof. Let $X := l^G$ be the compact metrizable space of all l -colorings of G with the right G -action $xg(h) = x(gh)$. We apply Theorem 3.6 to this space, the system A , set $H = \emptyset$ and a sufficiently small ϵ to ensure that $\rho(x, x') < \epsilon$ implies $x(e_G) = x'(e_G)$.

This yields certain $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S \subset G$ that enjoy the following property: given a coloring $x \in X$ there exist $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_m \subset N$ and $s \in S$ such that $\{sg(\vec{\alpha}), g \in A\}$ is monochrome. Observe that this property only involves a finite subset $T = \bigcup_{g \in A} Sg(\mathcal{F}(N)_<^m) \subset G$. $\square$

In the proof of our measure-theoretic recurrence result we will apply this combinatorial result to polynomial-valued polynomial mappings. We encode all the required information in the next corollary.

Corollary 3.8. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \leq F \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_\bullet)$ be VIP groups and $FE \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_\bullet)^{\otimes \omega}$ be a countable subgroup that is closed under substitutions $g \mapsto g[\vec{\beta}]$ (recall (2.23)).*

Then for any finite subsets $(R_i)_{i=0}^t \subset K^{\otimes m} \cap FE$, $(W_k)_{k=0}^{v-1} \subset F^{\otimes m} \cap FE$ there exist $N, w \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(L_i, M_i)_{i=1}^w \subset (K^{\otimes N} \cap FE) \times (F^{\otimes N} \cap FE)$ such that for every l -coloring of the latter set there exists a number a and sets $\beta_1 < \dots < \beta_m \subset N$ such that the set $(L_a R_i[\vec{\beta}], M_a W_k[\vec{\beta}] L_a^{-1})_{i,k}$ is monochrome (and in particular contained in the set $(L_i, M_i)_{i=1}^w$). We may assume $L_1 \equiv 1_G$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.22 the maps $\vec{\beta} \mapsto (R_i[\vec{\beta}], W_k[\vec{\beta}] R_i[\vec{\beta}])$ are polynomial expressions with values in $K^{\otimes \omega} \times F^{\otimes \omega}$. By the assumption they also take values in $FE \times FE$. Given an l -coloring χ of $(K^{\otimes \omega} \cap FE) \times (F^{\otimes \omega} \cap FE)$ we pass to the l -coloring $\tilde{\chi}(g, h) = \chi(g, hg^{-1})$. Corollary 3.7 then provides the desired N and $(L_i, M_i)_{i=1}^w = T \cup S$. $\square$

4. FVIP GROUPS

In this section we consider a class of IP-polynomials that IP-converge to orthogonal projections.

Definition 4.1. An *FVIP group* is a finitely generated VIP group.

The main result about FVIP groups is the following “nilpotent” version of [BFM96, Theorem 1.8] and [BHKM06, Theorem 1.9] that will be used to construct “primitive extensions” (we will recall the definitions of a primitive extension and an IP-limit in due time).

Theorem 4.2. *Let $G_\bullet$ be a prefiltration of finite length and $F \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_\bullet)$ be an FVIP group. Suppose that G_0 acts on a Hilbert space H by unitary operators and that for each $(g_\alpha)_\alpha \in F$ the weak limit $P_g = \text{w-IP-lim}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{F}} g_\alpha$ exists. Then*

- (1) *each P_g is an orthogonal projection and*
- (2) *these projections commute pairwise.*

The finite generation assumption cannot be omitted in view of a counterexample in [BFM96]. We begin with some algebraic preliminaries.

Hirsch length. We use Hirsch length of a group as a substitute for the concept of the rank of a free $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. Recall that a subnormal series in a group is called *polycyclic* if the quotients of consecutive subgroups in this series are cyclic and a group is called *polycyclic* if it admits a polycyclic series.

Definition 4.3. The *Hirsch length* $h(G)$ of a polycyclic group G is the number of infinite quotients of consecutive subgroups in a polycyclic series of G .

Recall that Hirsch length is well-defined by the Schreier refinement theorem, see e.g. [Rot95, Theorem 5.11]. For a finitely generated nilpotent group G with a filtration $G_\bullet$ one has

$$h(G) = \sum_i \text{rank } G_i / G_{i+1}.$$

Lemma 4.4. *Let G be a finitely generated nilpotent group. Then for every subgroup $V \leq G$ we have that $h(V) = h(G)$ if and only if $[G : V] < \infty$.*

Proof. If $[G : V] < \infty$ then we can find a finite index subgroup $W \leq V$ that is normal in G and $h(G) = h(W) = h(V)$ follows from the Schreier refinement theorem.

Let now $G_\bullet$ be the lower central series of G . Let $V \leq G$ be a subgroup with $h(V) = h(G)$ and assume in addition that $G_i \leq V$ for some $i = 1, \dots, d+1$. We show that

$[G : V] < \infty$ by induction on i . For $i = 1$ the claim is trivial and for $i = d + 1$ it provides the desired equivalence.

Assume that the claim holds for some i . Let $V_i = V \cap G_i$ be the filtration on V induced by $G_\bullet$ and assume $V_{i+1} = G_{i+1}$. By the assumption we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \text{rank } G_j/G_{j+1} = h(G) = h(V) = \sum_{j=1}^d \text{rank } V_j/V_{j+1},$$

and since $V_j/V_{j+1} \cong V_j G_{j+1}/G_{j+1} \leq G_j/G_{j+1}$ for every j this implies that $V_i/G_{i+1} \leq G_i/G_{i+1}$ is a finite index subgroup. Let $K \subset G_i$ be a finite set such that $KV_i/G_{i+1} = G_i/G_{i+1}$. Then $KV \leq G$ is a subgroup and a finite index extension of V . Moreover $KV \supseteq G_i$ and by the first part of the lemma we have $h(KV) = h(V)$.

By the induction hypothesis KV has finite index in G , so the index of V is also finite. $\square$

Lemma 4.5. *Let G be a finitely generated nilpotent group with a filtration $G_\bullet$ of length d and let $V \leq G$ a subgroup. Then for every $j = 1, \dots, d + 1$ and every $g \in G$ there exist at most finitely many finite index extensions of V of the form $\langle V, gc \rangle$ with $c \in G_j$.*

Proof. We use descending induction on j . The case $j = d + 1$ is clear, so assume that the conclusion is known for $j + 1$ and consider some $g \in G$.

Let $c_a, a = 0, 1$ be elements of G_j such that $\langle V, gc_a \rangle$ are finite index extensions of V . Then also $\langle VG_{j+1}, gc_a \rangle / G_{j+1}$ is a finite index extension of VG_{j+1}/G_{j+1} , so that there exists an $m > 0$ such that $(gc_a G_{j+1})^m \in VG_{j+1}/G_{j+1}$ for $a = 0, 1$.

Since the elements $c_a G_{j+1}$ are central in G/G_{j+1} this implies $(c_0^{-1}c_1)^m G_{j+1} \in (VG_{j+1} \cap G_j)/G_{j+1}$. But the latter group is a subgroup of the finitely generated abelian group G_j/G_{j+1} , so that $c_0^{-1}c_1 \in K(VG_{j+1} \cap G_j)$ for some finite set $K \subset G_j$ that does not depend on c_0, c_1 .

Multiplying c_1 with an element of V we may assume that $c_1 \in c_0 K G_{j+1}$. By the induction hypothesis for each $g' \in gc_0 K$ there exist at most finitely many finite index extensions of the form $\langle V, g'c' \rangle$ with $c' \in G_{j+1}$, so we have only finitely many extensions of the form $\langle V, gc_1 \rangle$ as required. $\square$

Corollary 4.6. *Let G be a finitely generated nilpotent group and V be a subgroup. Then there exist at most finitely many finite index extensions of V of the form $\langle V, c \rangle$.*

Proof. Consider any filtration $G_\bullet$ and apply Lemma 4.5 with $j = 1$ and $g = 1_G$. $\square$

Note that, in general, there does not exist a unique maximal finite index extension of a subgroup $V \leq G$. Take for example the group G generated by x, y, z with the relations $1_G = x^2 = y^2$, $xz = zx$, $yz = zy$, $[x, y] = z$ and consider $V = \{1_G\}$. Then the groups generated by x and by y are extensions of V with index 2, but $\langle x, y \rangle = G$ is infinite.

The following example shows that Corollary 4.6 may fail for virtually nilpotent groups. Consider the semidirect product $G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$ that is associated to the inversion action $\pi : \mathbb{Z}_2 \curvearrowright \mathbb{Z}$ given by $\pi(\bar{a})(b) = (-1)^a b$. Then $G_2 = [G, G] = 2\mathbb{Z}$ is an abelian subgroup of index 4 and $G_{i+1} = [G, G_i] = 2^i \mathbb{Z}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, so G is not nilpotent. Let $V = \{0\} \leq G$ be the trivial subgroup. Since we have $(\bar{1}a)^2 = 0 \in V$ for any $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, each group of the form $\langle V, \bar{1}a \rangle$ is an extension of V with index 2. On the other hand, for every value of a we obtain a different extension.

Partition theorems. Let $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_0 \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ be the set of non-empty finite subsets of the integers. An *IP-ring* is a subset of $\mathcal{F}$ that consists of all finite unions of a given strictly increasing chain $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \dots$ of elements of $\mathcal{F}$ [FK85, Definition 1.1]. In particular,

$\mathcal{F}$ is itself an IP-ring (associated to the chain $\{0\} < \{1\} < \dots$). Polynomials are generally assumed to be defined on $\mathcal{F}_0$ even if we manipulate them only on some sub-IP-ring of $\mathcal{F}$.

Since we will be dealing a lot with assertions about sub-IP-rings we find it convenient to introduce a shorthand notation. If some statement holds for a certain sub-IP-ring $\mathcal{F}' \subset \mathcal{F}$ then we say that it holds *without loss of generality* (wlog). In this case we reuse the symbol $\mathcal{F}$ to denote the sub-IP-ring on which the statement holds (in particular this IP-ring may change from use to use) and redefine $\mathcal{F}_0 := \mathcal{F} \cup \{\emptyset\}$. With this convention the basic Ramsey-type theorem about IP-rings, Hindman's theorem, reads as follows.

Theorem 4.7 (Hindman [Hin74]). *Every finite coloring of $\mathcal{F}$ is wlog monochrome.*

This is not the same as the assertion “wlog every finite coloring of $\mathcal{F}$ is monochrome”, since the latter would mean that there exists a sub-IP-ring on which *every* coloring is monochrome.

Recall also the following multiparameter version of Hindman's theorem.

Theorem 4.8 (Milliken [Mil75], Taylor [Tay76]). *Every finite coloring of $\mathcal{F}_{<}^k$ is wlog monochrome.*

The next lemma is a substitute for [BFM96, Lemma 1.6] in the non-commutative case. This is the place where the concept of Hirsch length is utilized.

Lemma 4.9. *Let G be a finitely generated nilpotent group and $g: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow G$ be any map. Then wlog there exist a natural number $l > 0$ and a subgroup $W \leq G$ such that for any $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_l \in \mathcal{F}$ the elements $g_{\alpha_1}, \dots, g_{\alpha_l}$ generate a finite index subgroup of W .*

Proof. By the Milliken-Taylor theorem 4.8 we may wlog assume that for each $l \leq h(G) + 1$ the Hirsch length $h(\langle g_{\alpha_1}, \dots, g_{\alpha_l} \rangle)$ does not depend on $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l) \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^l$. Call this value h_l . It is an increasing function of l that is bounded by $h(G)$, hence there exists an l such that $h_l = h_{l+1}$. Fix some $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l) \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^l$ and let $V := \langle g_{\alpha_1}, \dots, g_{\alpha_l} \rangle$.

Since $h_{l+1} = h_l$ and by Lemma 4.4 we see that $\langle V, g_\alpha \rangle$ is a finite index extension of V for each $\alpha > \alpha_l$. By Corollary 4.6 and Hindman's Theorem 4.7 we may wlog assume that each g_α lies in one such extension W . By definition of h_l this implies that wlog for every $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l) \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^l$ the Hirsch length of the group $\langle g_{\alpha_1}, \dots, g_{\alpha_l} \rangle \leq W$ is $h(W)$. Hence each $\langle g_{\alpha_1}, \dots, g_{\alpha_l} \rangle \leq W$ is a finite index subgroup by Lemma 4.4. $\square$

In course of proof of Theorem 4.2 it will be more convenient to use a convention for the symmetric derivative that differs from (2.18), namely

$$\hat{D}_\alpha g(\beta) = g(\alpha)^{-1} D_\alpha g(\beta).$$

Clearly a VIP group is also closed under $\hat{D}$. We begin with two results that allow to pass to a finite index subgroup of a VIP group when necessary.

Lemma 4.10. *Let F be a VIP group, $W \leq F$ be a subgroup and $V \leq W$ be a finite index subgroup. Suppose that $g \in F$ is such that the symmetric derivative $\hat{D}_\alpha g \in W$ for all α . Then wlog for every α the symmetric derivative $\hat{D}_\alpha g$ coincides with an element of V on some sub-IP-ring of the form $\{\beta \in \mathcal{F} : \beta > \beta_0\}$.*

Proof. Since V has finite index and by Hindman's theorem 4.7 we can wlog assume that $\hat{D}_\alpha g \in w^{-1}V$ for some $w \in W$ and all α . Assume that $w \notin V$. Let

$$h(\alpha) := w \hat{D}_\alpha g = \begin{cases} w, & \alpha = \emptyset \\ v_\alpha \in V & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_d$ be non-empty, by induction on d we see that $D_{\alpha_d} \dots D_{\alpha_1} h(\alpha) \in V$ for all $\alpha \neq \emptyset$ and $D_{\alpha_d} \dots D_{\alpha_1} h(\emptyset) \in V w^{(-1)^d} V$.

On the other hand the map $\alpha \mapsto h(\alpha)(\beta)$ is $G_{\bullet+1}$ -polynomial on $\{\alpha : \alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset\}$ for fixed β . Therefore $D_{\alpha_d} \dots D_{\alpha_1} h(\emptyset)$ vanishes at all $\beta > \alpha_d$, i.e. w coincides with an element of V on $\{\beta : \beta > \alpha_d\}$. $\square$

Lemma 4.11 ([BHKM06, Proposition 1.1]). *Let $W_\bullet$ be a prefiltration, $A \subset P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, W_\bullet)$ be finite and $V \leq W$ be a finite index subgroup. Then wlog for every $g \in A$ we have $g(\mathcal{F}_0) \subset V$.*

Proof. Passing to a subgroup we may assume that V is normal. By Hindman's theorem 4.7 we may wlog assume that every map $gV : \mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow W/V$, $g \in A$, is constant on $\mathcal{F}$. Since each gV is polynomial on $\mathcal{F}_0$ and vanishes at $\emptyset$ it vanishes identically. $\square$

IP-limits. Let X be a topological space, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $g : \mathcal{F}_<^m \rightarrow X$ be a map. We call $x \in X$ an IP-limit of g , in symbols $\text{IP-lim}_{\vec{\alpha}} g_{\vec{\alpha}} = x$, if for every neighborhood U of x there exists α_0 such that for all $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}_<^m$, $\vec{\alpha} > \alpha_0$, one has $g_{\vec{\alpha}} \in U$.

By the Milliken-Taylor theorem 4.8 and a diagonal argument we may wlog assume the existence of an IP-limit (even of countably many IP-limits) if X is a compact metric space, see [FK85, Theorem 1.5].

If X is a Hilbert space with the weak topology we write w-IP-lim instead of IP-lim to stress the topology. From the algebraic point of view it is more natural to consider maps defined on $\mathcal{F}_0$, in this case the IP-limit is just the IP-limit of the restriction to $\mathcal{F}$.

Following a tradition, we write arguments of maps defined on $\mathcal{F}$ as subscripts in this section. We also use the notation and assumptions of Theorem 4.2.

The next lemma follows from the equivalence of the weak and the strong topology on the unit sphere of H and is stated for convenience.

Lemma 4.12. *Assume that $f \in \text{fix } P_g$, i.e. that $\text{w-IP-lim}_{\alpha} g_{\alpha} f = f$. Then also $\text{IP-lim}_{\alpha} g_{\alpha} f = f$ (in norm).*

For any subgroup $V \leq F$ we write P_V for the orthogonal projection onto the space $\bigcap_{g \in V} \text{fix } P_g$.

Lemma 4.13. *Assume that $V = \langle g_1, \dots, g_s \rangle$ is a finitely generated group and that $P_{g_1}, \dots, P_{g_s}$ are commuting projections. Then $P_V = \prod_{i=1}^s P_{g_i}$.*

Proof. Clearly we have $P_V \leq \prod_{i=1}^s P_{g_i}$, so we only need to prove that each f that is fixed by $P_{g_1}, \dots, P_{g_s}$ is also fixed by P_g for any other $g \in V$.

For this end it suffices to show that if f is fixed by P_g and P_h for some $g, h \in V$ then it is also fixed by $P_{gh^{-1}}$. Lemma 4.12 shows that $\text{IP-lim}_{\alpha} g_{\alpha} f = f$ and $\text{IP-lim}_{\alpha} h_{\alpha} f = f$. Since each h_{α} is unitary we obtain $\text{IP-lim}_{\alpha} h_{\alpha}^{-1} f = f$. Since each g_{α} is isometric this implies

$$\text{w-IP-lim}_{\alpha} g_{\alpha} h_{\alpha}^{-1} f = \text{IP-lim}_{\alpha} g_{\alpha} h_{\alpha}^{-1} f = f$$

as required. $\square$

The next lemma is the main tool to ensure IP-convergence to zero.

Lemma 4.14 ([BFM96, Lemma 1.7]). *Let $(P_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{F}}$ be a family of commuting orthogonal projections on a Hilbert space H and $f \in H$. Suppose that, whenever $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_l$, one has $\prod_{i=1}^l P_{\alpha_i} f = 0$. Then $\text{IP-lim}_{\alpha} \|P_{\alpha} f\| = 0$.*

Finally we also need a van der Corput-type estimate.

Lemma 4.15 ([FK85, Lemma 5.3]). *Let $(x_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{F}}$ be a bounded family in a Hilbert space H . Suppose that*

$$\text{IP-lim}_{\beta} \text{IP-lim}_{\alpha} \langle x_{\alpha}, x_{\alpha \cup \beta} \rangle = 0.$$

Then wlog we have

$$\text{w-IP-lim}_{\alpha} x_{\alpha} = 0.$$

Proof of Theorem 4.2. We proceed by induction on the length of the prefiltration $G_\bullet$. If $G_\bullet$ is trivial there is nothing to prove. Assume that the conclusion is known for $G_{\bullet+1}$.

We start by proving the first assertion. Let $g \in F$. Since P_g is clearly contractive it suffices to show that it is a projection.

By Lemma 4.9 we may assume that, for some $l > 0$ and any $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_l$, the derivatives $\hat{D}_{\alpha_1}g, \dots, \hat{D}_{\alpha_l}g$ generate a finite index subgroup of some $W \leq F_1$ (recall that $F_1 = F \cap P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_{\bullet+1})$). We split

$$(4.16) \quad H = \cap_{V \leq W} \ker P_V \oplus \overline{\text{lin}}(\cup_{V \leq W} \text{im } P_V) =: H_0 \cup H_1,$$

where V runs over finite index subgroups of W . It suffices to show $P_g f = P_g^2 f$ for each f in one of these subspaces.

Case 0. Let $f \in H_0$ and $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_l$. By the choice of W we know that $V := \langle \hat{D}_{\alpha_1}g, \dots, \hat{D}_{\alpha_l}g \rangle \leq W$ is a finite index subgroup. Since the projections $P_{\hat{D}_{\alpha_i}g}$ commute by the inductive hypothesis, their product equals P_V (Lemma 4.13) and we have $P_V f = 0$ by the assumption.

By Lemma 4.14 this implies $\text{IP-lim}_\alpha \|P_{\hat{D}_\alpha g} f\| = 0$. Therefore

$$\text{IP-lim}_\alpha \left| \text{IP-lim}_\beta \langle (\hat{D}_\alpha g)_\beta f, g_\alpha^{-1} f \rangle \right| \leq \text{IP-lim}_\alpha \| \text{w-IP-lim}_\beta (\hat{D}_\alpha g)_\beta f \| = \text{IP-lim}_\alpha \|P_{\hat{D}_\alpha g} f\| = 0,$$

so that

$$\text{IP-lim}_\alpha \text{IP-lim}_\beta \langle g_{\alpha \cup \beta} f, g_\beta f \rangle = 0.$$

By Lemma 4.15 this implies $P_g f = 0$ (initially only wlog, but the limit is supposed to exist on the original IP-ring).

Case 1. Let $V \leq W$ and $f = P_V f$, by linearity we may assume $\|f\| = 1$. Let ρ be a metric for the weak topology on the unit ball of H with $\rho(x, y) \leq \|x - y\|$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. By definition of IP-convergence and uniform continuity of P_g there exists α_0 such that

$$\forall \alpha > \alpha_0 \quad \rho(g_\alpha f, P_g f) < \epsilon \text{ and } \rho(P_g g_\alpha f, P_g^2 f) < \epsilon.$$

By Lemma 4.10 we can choose $\alpha > \alpha_0$ such that $\hat{D}_\alpha g$ coincides with an element of V on some sub-IP-ring and in particular $P_{\hat{D}_\alpha g} f = f$. By Lemma 4.12 there exists $\beta_0 > \alpha$ such that

$$\forall \beta > \beta_0 \quad \|(\hat{D}_\alpha g)_\beta f - f\| < \epsilon.$$

Applying $g_\beta g_\alpha$ to the difference on the left-hand side we obtain

$$\|g_{\alpha \cup \beta} f - g_\beta g_\alpha f\| < \epsilon, \text{ so that } \rho(g_{\alpha \cup \beta} f, g_\beta g_\alpha f) < \epsilon.$$

Observe that $\alpha \cup \beta > \alpha_0$, so that

$$\rho(P_g f, g_\beta g_\alpha f) < 2\epsilon.$$

Taking IP-limit along β we obtain

$$\rho(P_g f, P_g g_\alpha f) \leq 2\epsilon.$$

A further application of the triangle inequality gives

$$\rho(P_g f, P_g^2 f) < 3\epsilon,$$

and since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary we obtain $P_g f = P_g^2 f$.

Commutativity of projections. Let us now prove the second assertion, namely that P_g and $P_{g'}$ commute for any $g, g' \in F$. Observe that the function $\alpha \mapsto g_\alpha$ can be seen as a polynomial-valued function in $P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, P(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet))$ whose values are constant polynomials. Moreover we can consider the constant function in $P(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, F_\bullet)$ whose value is g' . Taking their commutator we see that

$$\alpha \mapsto [g_\alpha, g'] \in P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, P(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)),$$

and since F is a VIP group this map in fact lies in $P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, F_\bullet)$. By (2.17) it takes values in F_1 . By Lemma 4.9 we may assume that for any $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_l$ the maps $[g_{\alpha_1}, g'], \dots, [g_{\alpha_l}, g']$ generate a finite index subgroup of some $W \leq F_1$. Interchanging g and g' and repeating this argument we may also wlog assume that for any $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_{l'}$ the maps $[g'_{\alpha_1}, g], \dots, [g'_{\alpha_{l'}}, g]$ generate a finite index subgroup of some $W' \leq F_1$. Consider the splitting

(4.17)

$$H = (\cap_{V \leq W} \ker P_V \cap \cap_{V' \leq W'} \ker P_{V'}) \oplus \overline{\lim} (\cup_{V \leq W} \text{im } P_V \cup \cup_{V' \leq W'} \text{im } P_{V'}) =: H_0 \cup H_1.$$

Case 0. Let $f \in H_0$. As above we have $\text{IP-lim}_\alpha \|P_{[g_\alpha, g']} f\| = 0$, and in particular

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \text{IP-lim}_\alpha \left\langle \text{w-IP-lim}_\beta [g_\alpha, g'_\beta] f, g_\alpha^{-1} P_{g'} f \right\rangle \\ &= \text{IP-lim}_\alpha \text{IP-lim}_\beta \left\langle g_\alpha g'_\beta f, g'_\beta P_{g'} f \right\rangle = \text{IP-lim}_\alpha \left\langle g_\alpha P_{g'} f, P_{g'} f \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

since $\text{IP-lim}_\beta g'_\beta P_{g'} f = P_{g'} f$ by Lemma 4.12. Hence $P_g P_{g'} f \perp P_{g'} f$, which implies $P_g P_{g'} f = 0$ since P_g is an orthogonal projection.

Interchanging the roles of g and g' we also obtain $P_{g'} P_g f = 0$.

Case 1. Let $V \leq W$ and $f = P_V f$. By Lemma 4.11 we may wlog assume that $[g_\alpha, g'] \in V$ for all α . Let α be arbitrary, by Lemma 4.12 the limit

$$\text{IP-lim}_\beta [g_\alpha, g'_\beta] f = f$$

also exists in norm. Therefore

$$g_\alpha P_{g'} f = \text{w-IP-lim}_\beta g_\alpha g'_\beta f = \text{w-IP-lim}_\beta g'_\beta g_\alpha [g_\alpha, g'_\beta] f = \text{w-IP-lim}_\beta g'_\beta g_\alpha f = P_{g'} g_\alpha f.$$

Taking IP-limits on both sides we obtain

$$P_g P_{g'} f = P_{g'} P_g f.$$

The case $V' \leq W'$ and $f = P_{V'} f$ can be handled in the same way. $\square$

If the group G acts by measure-preserving transformations then the Hilbert space projections identified in Theorem 4.2 are in fact conditional expectations as the following folklore lemma shows.

Lemma 4.18. *Let X be a probability space and $(T_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a net of operators on $L^2(X)$ induced by measure-preserving transformations. Assume that $T_\alpha \rightarrow P$ weakly for some projection P . Then P is a conditional expectation.*

Proof. Note that $\text{im } P \cap L^\infty(X)$ is dense in $\text{im } P$.

Let $f, g \in \text{im } P \cap L^\infty(X)$. Since the weak and the norm topology coincide on the unit sphere of $L^2(X)$ we have $\|T_\alpha f - f\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ and $\|T_\alpha g - g\|_2 \rightarrow 0$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|P(fg) - fg\|_2 &\leq \limsup_\alpha \|T_\alpha(fg) - fg\|_2 = \limsup_\alpha \|(T_\alpha f - f)T_\alpha g + f(T_\alpha g - g)\|_2 \\ &\leq \limsup_\alpha \|T_\alpha f - f\|_2 \|T_\alpha g\|_\infty + \|f\|_\infty \|T_\alpha g - g\|_2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\text{im } P \cap L^\infty(X)$ is an algebra, and the assertion follows. $\square$

Examples of FVIP groups. In order to obtain some tangible combinatorial applications of our results we will also need non-trivial examples of FVIP groups. It is then possible to combine them in an arbitrary fashion as the next lemma shows.

Lemma 4.19. *Let $F, F' \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_\bullet)$ be FVIP groups. Then the group $F \vee F'$ is also FVIP.*

Proof. The group $F \vee F'$ is clearly finitely generated and invariant under conjugation by constants. Closedness under $\tilde{D}$ follows from the identity

$$(4.20) \quad \tilde{D}_m(gh) = h^{-1} \tilde{D}_m g(m) h \tilde{D}_m h g(m)^{-1}. \quad \square$$

Our main example (that also leads to Theorem 1.1) are maps induced by polynomial sequences in finitely generated nilpotent groups. In this case the abstract notion of a polynomial admits an equivalent formulation in more familiar terms.

Lemma 4.21 ([Lei02, Proposition 3.9]). *Let G be a finitely generated torsion-free nilpotent group with a filtration $G_\bullet$ and a basis $T_1, \dots, T_t$. Then a map $g : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow G$ is polynomial if and only if it has the form $g(a) = T_1^{p_1(a)} \dots T_t^{p_t(a)}$ where each $p_i : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is a conventional polynomial of degree $\leq j$ (where j is determined by $T_i \in G_j \setminus G_{j+1}$).*

It remains to compose a polynomial sequence with an IP-sequence to obtain an FVIP-sequence.

Lemma 4.22. *Let G be a finitely generated nilpotent group with a filtration $G_\bullet$. Let $(n_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_0}$ be an IP-sequence in $\mathbb{Z}^k$ (i.e. $n_{\alpha \cup \beta} = n_\alpha + n_\beta$ whenever $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{F}_0$ are disjoint). Then the maps of the form*

$$\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_0(\mathbb{N}) \mapsto g^{p(n_\alpha)}, \text{ where } g \in G_i, p \in \mathbb{Z}[X], p(0) = 0, \deg p \leq i$$

generate an FVIP subgroup $F \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_\bullet)$.

Proof. It is clear that the maps of the above form are indeed polynomial and their symmetric derivatives have the same form. The generated subgroup $F \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_\bullet)$ is clearly closed under conjugation by constants and is closed under $\tilde{D}$ by (4.20). It remains to show that F is finitely generated.

For this end assume that G is torsion-free and let $T_1, \dots, T_t$ be an ordered basis of G . By Lemma 4.21 F is generated by maps of the form

$$\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_0(\mathbb{N}) \mapsto T_j^{q(n_\alpha)}, \text{ where } T_j \in G_i, q \text{ monomial with } \deg q \leq i.$$

Passing to a covering we may remove the assumption that G is torsion-free. $\square$

5. MEASURE RECURRENCE

In this section we prove a “nilpotent” generalization (Theorem 5.26) of the polynomial IP multiple recurrence theorem due to Bergelson and McCutcheon [BM00, Theorem 1.3]. We generally follow their proof and import many intermediate results whose proofs do not rely on commutativity. We write out only the parts of the argument that are different in the non-commutative setting.

We now fix a nilpotent group G with a filtration $G_\bullet$ and an FVIP group $F \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_\bullet)$.

Whenever we talk about measure spaces $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$, $(Y, \mathcal{B}, \nu)$ or $(Z, \mathcal{C}, \gamma)$ we suppose that they are regular and that G acts on them on the right by measure-preserving transformations. This induces a left action on the corresponding L^2 spaces. Recall that to every factor map $(Z, \mathcal{C}, \gamma) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{B}, \nu)$ there is associated an essentially unique measure disintegration

$$\gamma = \int_{y \in Y} \gamma_y d\nu(y),$$

see [Fur81, §5.4]. We write $\|\cdot\|_y$ for the norm on $L^2(Z, \gamma_y)$. Recall also that the fiber product $Z \times_Y Z$ is the space $Z \times Z$ with the measure $\int_{y \in Y} \gamma_y \otimes \gamma_y d\nu(y)$.

Extensions. Following the general scheme of Furstenberg’s proof, the multiple recurrence theorem is obtained by (in general transfinite) induction on a suitable chain of factors. In the induction step we go from a factor to a “primitive extension” that enjoys a dichotomy: each element of the given FVIP group acts on it either relatively compactly or relatively mixing. We review the steps in the construction of such an extension, referring to [BM00] for most proofs.

Compact extensions. We begin with the appropriate notion of relative compactness. Heuristically, an extension is relatively compact if it is generated by the image of a relatively Hilbert-Schmidt operator.

Definition 5.1 ([BM00, Definition 3.4]). Let $Z \rightarrow Y$ be a factor. A $Z|Y$ -kernel is a function $H \in L^\infty(Z \times_Y Z)$ such that

$$\int H(z_1, z_2) d\gamma_{z_2}(z_1) = 0$$

for a.e. $z_2 \in Z$. If H is a $Z|Y$ -kernel and $\phi \in L^2(Z)$ then

$$H * \phi(z_1) := \int H(z_1, z_2) \phi(z_2) d\gamma_{z_1}(z_2).$$

The map $\phi \mapsto H * \phi$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator on almost every fiber over Y with uniformly bounded Hilbert-Schmidt norm. These operators are self-adjoint provided that $H(z_1, z_2) = \overline{H(z_2, z_1)}$ a.e.

Definition 5.2 ([BM00, Definition 3.6]). Suppose that $X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Y$ is a chain of factors, $K \leq F$ is a subgroup and H is a non-trivial self-adjoint $X|Y$ -kernel that is K -invariant in the sense that

$$\text{IP-}\lim_{\alpha} g(\alpha)H = H$$

for every $g \in K$. The extension $Z \rightarrow Y$ is called K -compact if it is generated by functions of the form $H * \phi$, $\phi \in L^2(X)$.

Lemma 5.3 ([BM00, Remark 3.7(i)]). Let $X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Y$ be a chain of factors in which $Z \rightarrow Y$ is a K -compact extension generated by a $X|Y$ -kernel H . Then H is in fact a $Z|Y$ -kernel and Z is generated by functions of the form $H * \phi$, $\phi \in L^2(Z)$.

Proof. Call the projection maps $\pi : X \rightarrow Z$, $\theta : X \rightarrow Y$. Let $\phi \in L^2(X)$. Since $H * \phi$ is Z -measurable we have

$$\begin{aligned} H * \phi(x) &= \int H * \phi(x_1) d\mu_{\pi(x)}(x_1) \\ &= \int \int H(x_1, x_2) \phi(w_2) d\mu_{\theta(x_1)}(x_2) d\mu_{\pi(x)}(x_1) \\ &= \int \int H(x_1, x_2) \phi(x_2) d\mu_{\theta(x)}(x_2) d\mu_{\pi(x)}(x_1) \\ &= \int \int H(x_1, x_2) d\mu_{\pi(x)}(x_1) \phi(x_2) d\mu_{\theta(x)}(x_2) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(H|Z \times_Y X) * \phi(w). \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for all ϕ we obtain $H = \mathbb{E}(H|Z \times_Y X)$. Since H is self-adjoint this implies that H is $Z \times_Y Z$ -measurable. This in turn implies that $H * \phi = H * \mathbb{E}(\phi|Z)$ for all $\phi \in L^2(X)$. $\square$

In view of this lemma the reference to the ambient space X is not necessary in the definition of a K -compact extension. Just like in the commutative case, compactness

is preserved upon taking fiber products (this is only used in the part of the proof of Theorem 5.18 that we do not write out).

Lemma 5.4 ([BM00, Remark 3.7(ii)]). *Let $Z \rightarrow Y$ be a K -compact extension. Then $Z \times_Y Z \rightarrow Y$ is also a K -compact extension.*

Primitive extensions. Now we define what we mean by relative mixing and the dichotomy between relative compactness and relative mixing.

Definition 5.5 ([BM00, Definition 3.5]). *Let $Z \rightarrow Y$ be an extension. A map $g \in F$ is called *mixing on Z relatively to Y* if for every $H \in L^2(Z \times_Y Z)$ with $\mathbb{E}(H|Y) = 0$ one has $\text{w-IP-lim}_\alpha g(\alpha)H = 0$. An extension $Z \rightarrow Y$ is called *K -primitive* if it is K -compact and each $g \in F \setminus K$ is mixing on Z relative to Y .*

The next lemma is also used in the suppressed part of the proof of Theorem 5.18.

Lemma 5.6 ([BM00, Proposition 3.8]). *Let $Z \rightarrow Y$ be a K -primitive extension. Then $Z \times_Y Z \rightarrow Y$ is also a K -primitive extension.*

Like in the commutative setting [McC05, Lemma 2.8] the compact part of a primitive extension is wlog closed under taking derivatives, but there is also a new aspect, namely that it is also closed under conjugation by constants.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $Z \rightarrow Y$ be a K -primitive extension. Then K is closed under conjugation by constant functions. Moreover wlog K is an FVIP group.*

Proof. Let $g \in F \setminus K$, $h \in G$ and $H \in L^2(Z \times_Y Z)$ be such that $\mathbb{E}(H|Y) = 0$. Then

$$\text{w-IP-lim}_\alpha (h^{-1}gh)(\alpha)H = h^{-1} \text{w-IP-lim}_\alpha g(\alpha)(hH) = 0,$$

so that $F \setminus K$ is closed under conjugation by constant functions, so that K is also closed under conjugation by constant functions.

Since F is Noetherian, the subgroup K is finitely generated as a semigroup. For a generator $g \in K$ by Hindman's Theorem 4.7 we may wlog assume that either $\tilde{D}_\alpha g \in K$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ or $\tilde{D}_\alpha g \notin K$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$. In the latter case we obtain

$$0 = \text{w-IP-lim}_{\alpha, \beta} \tilde{D}_\beta g(\alpha)H = \text{IP-lim}_{\alpha, \beta} g(\alpha)^{-1}g(\alpha \cup \beta)g(\beta)^{-1}H = H,$$

a contradiction. Thus we may assume that all derivatives of the generators lie in K . This extends to the whole group K by (4.20) and invariance of K under conjugation by constants. $\square$

Existence of primitive extensions. Since our proof proceeds by induction over primitive extensions we need to know that such extensions exist. First we need a tool to locate non-trivial kernels.

Lemma 5.8 ([BM00, Lemma 3.12]). *Let $X \rightarrow Y$ be an extension. Suppose that $0 \neq H \in L^2(X \times_Y X)$ satisfies $\mathbb{E}(H|Y) = 0$ and that there exists $g \in F$ such that $\text{IP-lim}_\alpha g(\alpha)H = H$.*

Then there exists a non-trivial self-adjoint non-negative definite $X|Y$ -kernel H' such that $\text{IP-lim}_\alpha g(\alpha)H' = H'$.

Secondly we have to make sure that we cannot accidentally trivialize them.

Lemma 5.9 ([BM00, Lemma 3.14]). *Let $Z \rightarrow Y$ be a K -compact extension. Suppose that for some $g \in K$ and self-adjoint non-negative definite $Z|Y$ -kernel H we have*

$$\text{IP-lim}_\alpha \int (g(\alpha)H)(f' \otimes \tilde{f}') d\tilde{\gamma} = 0$$

for all $f' \in L^\infty(Z)$. Then $H = 0$.

The next theorem that provides existence of primitive extensions can now be proved in the same way as in the commutative case [BM00, Theorem 3.15]. The only change is that Theorem 4.2 is used instead of [BM00, Theorem 2.17] (note that F is Noetherian, being a finitely generated nilpotent group).

Theorem 5.10. *Let $X \rightarrow Y$ be a proper factor. Then there exists a subgroup $K \leq F$ and a factor $X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Y$ such that the extension $Z \rightarrow Y$ is proper and wlog K -primitive.*

Almost periodic functions. For the rest of Section 5 we fix a good group $\text{FE} \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)^{\otimes \omega}$. We will describe what we mean by “good” in Definition 5.23, for the moment it suffices to say that FE is countable.

Definition 5.11 ([BM00, Definition 3.1]). Suppose that $(Z, \mathcal{C}, \gamma) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{B}, \nu)$ is a factor and $K \leq F$ a subgroup. A function $f \in L^2(Z)$ is called K -almost periodic if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $g_1, \dots, g_l \in L^2(Z)$ and $D \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\nu(D) < \epsilon$ such that for every $\delta > 0$ and $R \in K^{\otimes \omega} \cap \text{FE}$ there exists α_0 such that for every $\alpha_0 < \vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}_<^\omega$ there exists a set $E = E(\vec{\alpha}) \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\nu(E) < \delta$ such that for all $y \in Y \setminus (D \cup E)$ there exists $1 \leq j \leq l$ such that

$$\|R(\alpha)f - g_j\|_Y < \epsilon.$$

The set of K -almost periodic functions is denoted by $\text{AP}(Z, Y, K)$.

The next lemma says that a characteristic function that can be approximated by almost periodic functions can be replaced by an almost periodic function right away.

Lemma 5.12 ([BM00, Theorem 3.3]). *Let $A \in \mathcal{C}$ be such that $1_A \in \overline{\text{AP}(Z, Y, K)}$ and $\delta > 0$. Then there exists a set $A' \subset A$ such that $\gamma(A \setminus A') < \delta$ and $1_{A'} \in \text{AP}(Z, Y, K)$.*

In the following lemma we have to restrict ourselves to $K^{\otimes \omega} \cap \text{FE}$ since $K^{\otimes \omega}$ need not be countable.

Lemma 5.13 ([BM00, Proposition 3.9]). *Let $X \rightarrow Y$ be an extension, $K \leq F$ a subgroup and H a $X|Y$ -kernel that is K -invariant. Then wlog for all $R \in K^{\otimes \omega} \cap \text{FE}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there exists α_0 such that for all $\alpha_0 < \vec{\alpha}$ we have*

$$\|R(\vec{\alpha})H - H\| < \epsilon.$$

With help of the above lemma we can show that in fact wlog every characteristic function can be approximated by almost periodic functions. In view of Lemma 5.12 this allows us to reduce the question of multiple recurrence in a primitive extension to multiple recurrence for (relatively) almost periodic functions.

Lemma 5.14 ([BM00, Theorem 3.11]). *Let $Z \rightarrow Y$ be a K -compact extension. Then wlog $\text{AP}(Z, Y, K)$ is dense in $L^2(Z)$.*

Multiple mixing. Under sufficiently strong relative mixing assumptions the limit behavior of a multicorrelation sequence $\prod_i S_i(\alpha)f_i$ on a primitive extension only depends on the expectations of the functions on the base space. The appropriate conditions on the set $\{S_i\}_i$ are as follows.

Definition 5.15. Let $K \leq F$ be a subgroup. We call a subset $A \subset F$ K -mixing if $1_G \in A$ and $g^{-1}h \in F \setminus K$ whenever $g \neq h \in A$.

The requirement $1_G \in A$ is not essential but is convenient in inductive arguments. In order to apply PET induction we will need the next lemma.

We say that a subgroup $K \leq F$ is *invariant under equality of tails* if whenever $S \in K$ and $T \in F$ are such that there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{F}$ with $S_\alpha = T_\alpha$ for all $\alpha > \beta$ we have $T \in K$. Every group $K \leq F$ that is the compact part of some primitive extension has this property.

Lemma 5.16. *Let $K \leq F$ be a subgroup that is invariant under equality of tails. Let $S, T \in F$ be such that $S^{-1}T \notin K$. Then wlog*

$$(S\tilde{D}_\beta S)^{-1}(T\tilde{D}_\beta T) \notin K \quad \text{and} \quad S^{-1}(T\tilde{D}_\beta T) \notin K$$

for all $\beta \in \mathcal{F}_0$.

Proof. If the first conclusion fails then by Hindman's theorem 4.7 wlog

$$h(\alpha) := (S\tilde{D}_\alpha S)^{-1}(T\tilde{D}_\alpha T) \in K \text{ for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{F}$$

and $h(\emptyset) \notin K$. Proceed as in the proof of Lemma 4.10. Analogously for the second conclusion. $\square$

The next lemma is a manifestation of the principle that compact orbits can be thought of as being constant.

Lemma 5.17 ([BM00, Proposition 4.2]). *Let $Z \rightarrow Y$ be a K -primitive extension, $R^\beta \in K$ for each $\beta \in \mathcal{F}$ and $W \in F \setminus K$. Let also $f, f' \in L^\infty(Z)$ be such that either $\mathbb{E}(f|Y) = 0$ or $\mathbb{E}(f'|Y) = 0$. Then wlog*

$$\text{IP-lim}_{\beta, \alpha} \|\mathbb{E}(R^\beta(\alpha)fW(\beta)f'|Y)\| = 0.$$

We come to the central result on multiple mixing.

Theorem 5.18 (cf. [BM00, Theorem 4.10]). *Let $K \leq F$ be a subgroup. For every K -mixing set $\{S_0 \equiv 1_G, S_1, \dots, S_t\} \subset F$ the following statements hold.*

(1) *For every K -primitive extension $Z \rightarrow Y$ and any $f_0, \dots, f_t \in L^\infty(Z)$ we have wlog*

$$\text{w-IP-lim}_{\alpha} \prod_{i=1}^t S_i(\alpha)f_i - \prod_{i=1}^t S_i(\alpha)\mathbb{E}(f_i|Y) = 0.$$

(2) *For every K -primitive extension $Z \rightarrow Y$ and any $f_0, \dots, f_t \in L^\infty(Z)$ we have wlog*

$$\text{IP-lim}_{\alpha} \left\| \mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{i=0}^t S_i(\alpha)f_i|Y\right) - \prod_{i=0}^t S_i(\alpha)\mathbb{E}(f_i|Y) \right\| = 0.$$

(3) *For every K -primitive extension $Z \rightarrow Y$, any $U_{i,j} \in K$ and any $f_{i,j} \in L^\infty(Z)$ we have wlog*

$$\text{IP-lim}_{\alpha} \left\| \mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{i=0}^t S_i(\alpha)\left(\prod_{j=0}^s U_{i,j}(\alpha)f_{i,j}\right)|Y\right) - \prod_{i=0}^t S_i(\alpha)\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{j=0}^s U_{i,j}(\alpha)f_{i,j}|Y\right) \right\| = 0.$$

We point out that the main induction loop is on the mixing set. It is essential that, given $K \leq F$, all statements are proved simultaneously for all K -compact extension since the step from weak convergence to strong convergence involves a fiber product via Lemma 5.6.

Proof. The proof is by PET-induction on the mixing set. We only prove that the last statement for mixing sets with lower weight vector implies the first, the proofs of other implications are the same as in the commutative case.

By the telescope identity it suffices to consider the case $\mathbb{E}(f_{i_0}|Y) = 0$ for some i_0 . By the van der Corput Lemma 4.15 it suffices to show that wlog

$$\text{IP-lim}_{\beta, \alpha} \int_Z \prod_{i=1}^t S_i(\alpha)f_i \prod_{i=1}^t S_i(\alpha \cup \beta)\bar{f}_i = 0.$$

This limit can be written as

$$\text{IP-lim}_{\beta, \alpha} \int_Z \prod_{i=1}^t S_i(\alpha)f_i \prod_{i=1}^t \underbrace{S_i(\alpha)\tilde{D}_\beta S_i(\alpha)}_{=: T_{i,\beta}(\alpha)} (S_i(\beta)\bar{f}_i).$$

By Lemma 5.16 we may wlog assume that $T_{i,\beta}^{-1}T_{j,\beta}$ and $S_i^{-1}T_{j,\beta}$ are mixing for all $\beta \in \mathcal{T}_0$ provided that $i \neq j$. Re-indexing if necessary and using Hindman's theorem 4.7 we may wlog assume $S_i^{-1}T_{i,\beta} \in K$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{T}$ and $i \leq w$ and $S_i^{-1}T_{i,\beta} \notin K$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{T}$ and $i > w$ for some $w = 0, \dots, t$. Thus

$$(5.19) \quad S_0, S_1, \dots, S_t, T_{w+1,\beta}, \dots, T_{t,\beta}$$

is a K -mixing set for every $\beta \neq \emptyset$. Moreover it has the same weight vector as $\{S_1, \dots, S_t\}$ since $T_{i,\beta} \sim S_i$. Assume that S_j , $j \neq 0$, has the maximal level in (5.19). We have to show

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IP-lim}_{\beta, \alpha} \int_Z \prod_{i=1}^w S_j^{-1}(\alpha) S_i(\alpha) (f_i \tilde{D}_\beta S_i(\alpha) (S_i(\beta) \tilde{f}_i)) \\ \cdot \prod_{i=w+1}^t S_j^{-1}(\alpha) S_i(\alpha) f_i S_j^{-1}(\alpha) T_{i,\beta}(\alpha) (S_i(\beta) \tilde{f}_i) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and for each fixed $\beta \in \mathcal{T}$ the limit along α comes from the K -mixing set

$$S_j^{-1}S_1, \dots, S_j^{-1}S_t, S_j^{-1}T_{w+1,\beta}, \dots, S_j^{-1}T_{t,\beta}$$

that has lower weight vector. Hence we can apply the induction hypothesis, thereby obtaining that the limit equals

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IP-lim}_{\beta, \alpha} \int_Z \prod_{i=1}^w S_j^{-1}(\alpha) S_i(\alpha) \mathbb{E}(f_i \tilde{D}_\beta S_i(\alpha) (S_i(\beta) \tilde{f}_i) | Y) \\ \cdot \prod_{i=w+1}^t S_j^{-1}(\alpha) S_i(\alpha) \mathbb{E}(f_i | Y) S_j^{-1}(\alpha) T_{i,\beta}(\alpha) \mathbb{E}(S_i(\beta) \tilde{f}_i | Y) \end{aligned}$$

This clearly vanishes if $i_0 > w$, otherwise use Lemma 5.17. $\square$

Multivariable polynomial mixing. In fact we need some information about relative polynomial mixing in several variables. First we need to say what we understand under a mixing system of polynomial expressions. Recall that by definition each $S \in F^{\otimes m}$ can be written in the form

$$(5.20) \quad S(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) = W^{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1})}(\alpha_m) \dots W^{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2) W(\alpha_1).$$

Definition 5.21. Let $K \leq F$ be a subgroup and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We call a set $\{S_i\}_{i=0}^t \subset F^{\otimes m}$ K -mixing if $S_0 \equiv 1_G$, the polynomial expressions $\{S_i\}$ are pairwise distinct and for all r and $i \neq j$ we have either $\forall \vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{T}_{<}^r W_i^{\vec{\alpha}} = W_j^{\vec{\alpha}}$ or $\forall \vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{T}_{<}^r (W_i^{\vec{\alpha}})^{-1} W_j^{\vec{\alpha}} \notin K$.

Note that this definition requires more than $\{W_i^{\vec{\alpha}}\}_i$ being (up to multiplicity) a K -mixing set. However this definition still agrees with the previous definition of a K -mixing subset of F if $m = 1$.

Theorem 5.22 (cf. [BM00, Theorem 4.12]). *Let $Z \rightarrow Y$ be a K -primitive extension. Then for every $m \geq 1$, every K -mixing set $\{S_0, \dots, S_t\} \subset F^{\otimes m}$ and any $f_0, \dots, f_t \in L^\infty(Z)$ we have wlog*

$$\text{IP-lim}_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{i=0}^t S_i(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) f_i | Y \right) - \prod_{i=0}^t S_i(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \mathbb{E}(f_i | Y) \right\| = 0.$$

Proof. We use induction on m . The case $m = 0$ is trivial since the product then consists only of one term. Assume that the conclusion holds for m and consider a K -mixing set of polynomial expressions in $m + 1$ variables. For brevity we write $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$ and $\alpha = \alpha_{m+1}$. We may assume that $\|f_i\|_\infty \leq 1$ for all i and $\mathbb{E}(f_{i_0} | Y) = 0$ for some i_0 .

By Definition 5.21 and using notation from (5.20) for every $\vec{\alpha}$ there exists a K -mixing set $\{V_j^{\vec{\alpha}}\} \subset F$ such that $W_i^{\vec{\alpha}} = V_{j_i}^{\vec{\alpha}}$, where the assignment $i \rightarrow j_i$ does not depend on $\vec{\alpha}$. Let also

$$A_j = \{S(\cdot) = S_i(\cdot, \emptyset) : j_i = j\}.$$

In view of the Milliken-Taylor theorem 4.8 and by a diagonal argument it suffices to show that for every $\delta > 0$ there exist $\vec{\alpha} < \alpha$ such that

$$\left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_j V_j^{\vec{\alpha}}(\alpha) \left(\prod_{S \in A_j} S(\vec{\alpha}) f_{S,j} \right) \middle| Y \right) \right\| \leq \delta$$

provided that $\mathbb{E}(f_{S_0, j_0} | Y) = 0$ for some j_0, S_0 . By the induction hypothesis there exists $\vec{\alpha}$ such that

$$\left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{S \in A_{j_0}} S(\vec{\alpha}) f_{S, j_0} \middle| Y \right) \right\| < \delta$$

since A_{j_0} is a K -mixing set. This implies

$$\left\| \prod_j V_j^{\vec{\alpha}}(\alpha) \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{S \in A_j} S(\vec{\alpha}) f_{S,j} \middle| Y \right) \right\| < \delta$$

for all $\alpha > \vec{\alpha}$. Since $\{V_j^{\vec{\alpha}}\}_j$ is a K -mixing set Theorem 5.18 implies

$$\text{IP-lim}_{\alpha} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_j V_j^{\vec{\alpha}}(\alpha) \prod_{S \in A_j} S(\vec{\alpha}) f_{S,j} \middle| Y \right) \right\| \leq \delta. \quad \square$$

SZ property. We are nearing our main result, a multiple recurrence theorem for polynomial expressions. In order to guarantee the existence of the limits that we will encounter during its proof we have to restrict ourselves to a certain good subgroup of the group of polynomial expressions. It will be shown later that this restriction can be removed, cf. Corollary 5.31.

Definition 5.23. We call a group $\text{FE} \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_{\bullet})^{\otimes \omega}$ *good* if it has the following properties.

- (1) (cardinality) FE is countable,
- (2) (substitution) if $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $g \in P_0(\mathcal{F}_0, G_{\bullet})^{\otimes m} \cap \text{FE}$ and $\vec{\beta} \in (\mathcal{F}_0)_{<}^m$ then $g[\vec{\beta}] \in \text{FE}$ and
- (3) (decomposition) if $K \leq F$ is a subgroup invariant under conjugation by constants and $\{S_i\}_{i=0}^t \subset F^{\otimes m} \cap \text{FE}$ is a finite set with $S_0 \equiv 1_G$ then we have finite sets $\{T_k\}_{k=0}^{v-1} \subset F^{\otimes m} \cap \text{FE}$ and $\{R_i\}_{i=0}^t \subset K^{\otimes m} \cap \text{FE}$ with $R_0 = T_0 \equiv 1_G$ such that $S_i = T_{k_i} R_i$ and for every sub-IP-ring $\mathcal{F}' \subset \mathcal{F}$ the set $\{T_k\}$ is wlog K -mixing.

The property of being good is hereditary in the sense that a group that is good with respect to some IP-ring is also good with respect to any sub-IP-ring.

Let $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a regular measure space with a right action of G by measure-preserving transformations. Let also $\text{FE} \leq F^{\otimes \omega}$ be a good group. By Hindman's theorem 4.7 we may wlog assume that

$$\text{w-IP-lim}_{\alpha} g(\alpha) f$$

exists for every $g \in F$ and $f \in L^2(X)$ and by the Milliken-Taylor theorem 4.8 we may wlog assume that the limit

$$\text{IP-lim}_{\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^m} \mu \left(\cap_{i=0}^t A S_i(\vec{\alpha})^{-1} \right)$$

exists for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and every finite set $\{S_0, \dots, S_t\} \subset F^{\otimes m} \cap \text{FE}$.

Definition 5.24. A factor $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{B}, \nu)$ is said to have the *SZ (Szemerédi) property* if for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\nu(B) > 0$ and every set of polynomial expressions $\{S_0 \equiv 1_G, S_1, \dots, S_t\} \subset F^{\otimes m} \cap \text{FE}$ one has

$$\text{IP-lim}_{\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^m} \mu \left(\cap_{i=0}^t B S_i(\vec{\alpha})^{-1} \right) > a(B, m, \{S_i\}_i) > 0.$$

Note that unlike in [BM00, Definition 5.1] the constant depends not only on the number of polynomial expressions. We cannot obtain more uniform results due to the lack of control on the number w provided by Corollary 3.8.

Lemma 5.25 ([BM00, Proposition 5.2]). *For every separable regular measure-preserving system X there exists a maximal factor that has the SZ property.*

Theorem 5.26. *The identity factor $X \rightarrow X$ has the SZ property.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.25 there exists a maximal factor $X \rightarrow Y$ with the SZ property. Assume that $X \neq Y$, then by Theorem 5.10 wlog there exists a subgroup $K \leq F$ and a factor $X \rightarrow Z$ such that $(Z, \mathcal{C}, \lambda) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{B}, \nu)$ is a proper K -primitive extension. We will show that Z also has the SZ property, thereby contradicting maximality of Y .

Let $A \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\lambda(A) > 0$ and $\{S_i\}_{i=0}^t \subset F^{\otimes m} \cap \text{FE}$ be a finite set with $S_0 \equiv 1_G$. We have to show

$$(5.27) \quad \text{IP-lim}_{\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^m} \mu \left(\cap_{i=0}^t A S_i(\vec{\alpha})^{-1} \right) > 0.$$

By Lemma 5.7 we may wlog assume that K is an FVIP group and by Lemma 5.14 that AP is dense in $L^2(Z)$. Note that FE is still good with respect to the new IP-ring implied in the “wlog” notation. Thus wlog we have a K -mixing set $\{W_k\}_{k=0}^{v-1}$ and polynomial expressions $R_i \in K^{\otimes m} \cap \text{FE}$ with $R_0 \equiv 1_G$ such that $S_i = W_{k_i} R_i$.

By Lemma 5.12 we may replace A by a subset that has at least one half of its measure such that $1_A \in \text{AP}$. There exist $c = c(\lambda(A)) > 0$ and a set $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\nu(B) > c$ and $\lambda_y(A) > c$ for every $y \in B$. Pick $0 < \epsilon < \min(c/2, c^v/(4(t+1)))$.

By Corollary 3.8 there exist $N, w \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\{L_i, M_i\}_{i=1}^w \subset (K^{\otimes N} \cap \text{FE}) \times (F^{\otimes N} \cap \text{FE})$$

such that for every l -coloring of $\{L_i, M_i\}$ there exists a number a and sets $\beta_1 < \dots < \beta_m \subset N$ such that the set $\{L_a R_i[\vec{\beta}], M_a W_k[\vec{\beta}] L_a^{-1}\}_{0 \leq i \leq t, 0 \leq k < v}$ is monochrome (and in particular contained in the set $\{L_i, M_i\}$).

Since $f = 1_A \in \text{AP}$ there exist functions $g_1, \dots, g_l \in L^2(Z)$ and a set $D \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\nu(D) < \epsilon$ and for every $\delta > 0$ and $T \in K^{\otimes N} \cap \text{FE}$ there exists α_0 such that for every $\alpha_0 < \vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^N$ there exists a set $E = E(\vec{\alpha}) \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\nu(E) < \delta$ such that for every $y \in (D \cup E)^c$ there exists j such that $\|T(\vec{\alpha})f - g_j\|_y < \epsilon$. Let $B' = B \cap D^c$, so that $\nu(B') > c/2$.

Let $Q = |\mathcal{F}(N)^m|$ be the number of possible choices of $\vec{\beta} \in \mathcal{F}(N)^m$ and

$$\alpha := a(B', N, \{1_G\} \cup \{M_i W_k[\vec{\beta}]\}_{1 \leq i \leq w, k < v, \vec{\beta} \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^m(N)}) > 0.$$

Using this with $\delta = \alpha_1/2w^2$ and $T = L_1, \dots, L_w$ we obtain wlog for every $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^N$ a set $E = E(\vec{\alpha}) \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\nu(E) < \alpha_1/2w$ such that for every $y \in (D \cup E)^c$ and every $i = 1, \dots, w$ there exists $j = j(y, i)$ such that

$$(5.28) \quad \|L_i(\vec{\alpha})f - g_j\|_y < \epsilon \text{ for every } 1 \leq i \leq w.$$

By Theorem 5.22 we may also wlog assume that for every $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^N$ we have

$$(5.29) \quad \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{k < v} W_k(\vec{\alpha}) f \mid Y \right) - \prod_{k < v} W_k(\vec{\alpha}) \mathbb{E}(f \mid Y) \right\| < c^v (\alpha_1/2wQ)^{1/2}/4.$$

Recall that we have to show (5.27). For this end it suffices to find $a(A, m, \{S_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq t})$ such that for an arbitrary sub-IP-ring there exists $\vec{\gamma} \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^m$ with

$$\mu\left(\cap_{i=0}^t A S_i(\vec{\gamma})^{-1}\right) > a(A, m, \{S_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq t}) > 0,$$

so fix a sub-IP-ring $\mathcal{F}$. By definition of a_1 there exists a tuple $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^N$ (that will remain fixed) such that

$$\nu(C_0) > a_1, \text{ where } C_0 := \cap_{i=1, \dots, w, k < v, \beta} B' W_k[\vec{\beta}](\vec{a})^{-1} M_i(\vec{a})^{-1}.$$

Let

$$C := C_0 \setminus \cup_{i=1}^w E(\vec{a}) M_i(\vec{a})^{-1},$$

so that $\nu(C) > a_1/2$. For every $y \in C$ consider an l -coloring of $\{L_i, M_i\}_i$ given by $i \in [1, w] \mapsto j(y M_i(\vec{a}), i)$ determined by (5.28). By the assumptions on $\{L_i, M_i\}$ there exist $j(y)$, $a \in [1, w]$ and $\beta_1 < \dots < \beta_m \subset N$ such that

$$\|L_a(\vec{a}) R_i[\vec{\beta}](\vec{a}) f - g_{j(y)}\|_{y M_a(\vec{a}) W_k(\vec{\beta}) L_a(\vec{a})^{-1}} < \epsilon \text{ for every } 0 \leq i \leq t, 0 \leq k < v.$$

This can also be written as

$$\|W_k[\vec{\beta}](\vec{a}) R_i[\vec{\beta}](\vec{a}) f - W_k[\vec{\beta}](\vec{a}) L_a(\vec{a})^{-1} g_{j(y)}\|_{y M_a(\vec{a})} < \epsilon \text{ for every } 0 \leq i \leq t, 0 \leq k < v.$$

Since this holds for every i, k and we have $R_0 \equiv 1_G$ this implies

$$\|(W_k R_i)[\vec{\beta}](\vec{a}) f - W_k[\vec{\beta}](\vec{a}) f\|_{y M_a(\vec{a})} < 2\epsilon.$$

Passing to a subset $C' \subset C$ with measure at least $a_1/2wQ$ we may assume that a and $\vec{\beta}$ do not depend on y . Thus we obtain a set $B'' := C' M_a(\vec{a})$ of measure at least $a_1/2wQ$ and a tuple $(\gamma_j = \cup_{i \in \beta_j} \alpha_i)_{j=1}^m$ such that

$$\|W_k R_i(\vec{\gamma}) f - W_k(\vec{\gamma}) f\|_y < 2\epsilon$$

for every $y \in B''$, i and k . Recall that f is $\{0, 1\}$ -valued, so that

$$\left\| \prod_{i=0}^t S_i(\vec{\gamma}) f - \prod_{k < v} W_k(\vec{\gamma}) f \right\|_y = \left\| \prod_{i=0}^t W_{k_i} R_i(\vec{\gamma}) f - \prod_{i=0}^t W_{k_i}(\vec{\gamma}) f \right\|_y < 2(t+1)\epsilon$$

for all $y \in B''$. Moreover, since $B'' \subset \cap_j B' W_j(\vec{\gamma})^{-1}$, one has

$$\left| \prod_{k < v} W_k(\vec{\gamma}) \mathbb{E}(f|Y)(y) \right| \geq c^v$$

for every $y \in B''$. Therefore and by (5.29) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \prod_{i=0}^t S_i(\vec{\gamma}) f \right\| &\geq \left\| \prod_{i=0}^t S_i(\vec{\gamma}) f \right\|_{L^2(B'')} \\ &> \left\| \prod_{k < v} W_k(\vec{\gamma}) f \right\|_{L^2(B'')} - 2(t+1)\epsilon \nu(B'')^{1/2} \\ &\geq \left\| \mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{k < v} W_k(\vec{\gamma}) f | Y\right) \right\|_{L^2(B'')} - 2(t+1)\epsilon \nu(B'')^{1/2} \\ &\geq \left\| \prod_{k < v} W_k(\vec{\gamma}) \mathbb{E}(f|Y) \right\|_{L^2(B'')} - \left\| \mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{k < v} W_k(\vec{\gamma}) f | Y\right) - \prod_{k < v} W_k(\vec{\gamma}) \mathbb{E}(f|Y) \right\| \\ &\quad - 2(t+1)\epsilon \nu(B'')^{1/2} \\ &> c^v (a_1/2wQ)^{1/2}/4 =: a(A, m, \{S_i\}_i)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Good groups of polynomial expressions. As we have already mentioned, good groups are just technical vehicles. The point is that we can perform all operations we are interested in within a countable set of polynomial expressions, so that we can wlog assume the existence of all IP-limits that we encounter.

The only non-trivial property of good groups is the decomposition property. However, the following lemma essentially shows that it is always satisfied.

Proposition 5.30. *Let $K \leq F$ be a subgroup that is invariant under conjugation by constants, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{S_i\}_{i=0}^t \subset F^{\otimes m}$ be any finite set with $S_0 \equiv 1_G$. Then there exists a set $\{T_k\}_{k=0}^v \subset F^{\otimes m}$ that is wlog K -mixing and decompositions $S_i = T_{k_i} R_i$ such that $R_i \in K^{\otimes m}$.*

Proof. We argue by induction on m . The claim is trivial for $m = 0$. Assume that it holds for m , we show its validity for $m + 1$. For brevity we write $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$, $\alpha = \alpha_{m+1}$.

Consider the maps $\tilde{S}_i(\vec{\alpha}) = S_i(\vec{\alpha}, \emptyset)$. By the induction hypothesis there exists a set $\{\tilde{T}_k\}_{k=0}^v \subset F^{\otimes m}$ that is wlog K -mixing and decompositions $\tilde{S}_i = \tilde{T}_{k_i} \tilde{R}_i$ such that $\tilde{R}_i \in K^{\otimes m}$. Then $S_i(\vec{\alpha}, \alpha) = W_i^{\vec{\alpha}}(\alpha) \tilde{T}_{k_i}(\vec{\alpha}) \tilde{R}_i(\vec{\alpha})$.

Let $i < j$. By the Milliken-Taylor Theorem 4.8 we may wlog assume that either $(W_i^{\vec{\alpha}})^{-1} W_j^{\vec{\alpha}} \notin K$ for all $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^m$ (in which case we do nothing) or $(W_i^{\vec{\alpha}})^{-1} W_j^{\vec{\alpha}} \in K$ for all $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^m$. In the latter case we have $W_j^{\vec{\alpha}} = W_i^{\vec{\alpha}} R^{\vec{\alpha}}$ with some $R^{\vec{\alpha}} \in K$ and we can write

$$S_j(\vec{\alpha}, \alpha) = W_i^{\vec{\alpha}}(\alpha) \tilde{T}_{k_j}(\vec{\alpha}) \underbrace{(\tilde{T}_{k_j}(\vec{\alpha})^{-1} R^{\vec{\alpha}} \tilde{T}_{k_j}(\vec{\alpha}))}_{\in K} (\alpha) \tilde{R}_j(\vec{\alpha}), \quad \vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{F}_{<}^m.$$

Doing this for all pairs $i < j$ we obtain the requested decomposition with the set $\{T_k\}$ consisting of all products $W_i^{\vec{\alpha}} \tilde{T}_{k_j}(\vec{\alpha})$ that occur above. $\square$

Corollary 5.31. *Every finite subset of $F^{\otimes \omega}$ is wlog contained in a good subgroup of $P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)^{\otimes \omega}$.*

Proof. Since F is a countable Noetherian group it has at most countably many subgroups. Moreover each $(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset)_{<}^m$ is countable and there are only countably many finite tuples in any countable set. Hence we can use Proposition 5.30 to obtain a countable descending chain of sub-IP-rings such that the decomposition property holds for each tuple for one of these sub-IP-rings. The required sub-IP-ring is then obtained by a diagonal procedure, cf. [FK85, Lemma 1.4]. $\square$

Thus the good group is not really relevant for our multiple recurrence theorem that we can now formulate as follows.

Theorem 5.32. *Let G be a nilpotent group and $F \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)$ an FVIP group. Consider a right measure-preserving action of G on an arbitrary (not necessarily regular) probability space $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$. Let $S_0, \dots, S_t \in F^{\otimes m}$ be arbitrary polynomial expressions and $A \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\mu(A) > 0$. Then there exists a sub-IP-ring $\mathcal{F}' \subset \mathcal{F}$ such that*

$$\text{IP-lim}_{\vec{\alpha} \in (\mathcal{F}')_{<}^m} \mu \left(\cap_{i=0}^t A S_i(\vec{\alpha})^{-1} \right) > 0.$$

Proof. We can assume $S_0 \equiv 1_G$. By Corollary 5.31 we may assume that $S_0, \dots, S_t \in \text{FE}$ for some good subgroup $\text{FE} \leq P_0(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset, G_\bullet)^{\otimes m}$. Then we can replace G by a countable group that is generated by the union of ranges of elements of FE . Afterward we can replace $\mathcal{A}$ by a separable G -invariant σ -algebra generated by A . Finally we can assume that X is regular and apply Theorem 5.26. $\square$

Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorem 5.32 and Lemma 4.22 with the filtration (2.27), d being the maximal degree of polynomials $p_{i,j}$. By the Furstenberg correspondence principle we obtain the following combinatorial corollary.

Corollary 5.33. *Let G be a finitely generated nilpotent group, $T_1, \dots, T_t \in G$ and $p_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_m]$, $i = 1, \dots, t$, $j = 1, \dots, s$, be polynomials that vanish at 0. Then for every subset $E \subset G$ with positive upper Banach density the set*

$$\left\{ \vec{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^m : \exists g \in G : g \prod_{i=1}^t T_i^{p_{i,j}(\vec{n})} \in E, j = 1, \dots, s \right\}$$

is IP^* in $\mathbb{Z}^m$.

REFERENCES

- [BBH94] V. Bergelson, A. Blass, and N. Hindman, *Partition theorems for spaces of variable words*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **68** (1994), no. 3, 449–476. MR1262304 (95i:05107) ↑4
- [Ber87] V. Bergelson, *Weakly mixing PET*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **7** (1987), no. 3, 337–349. MR912373 (89g:28022) ↑8
- [BFM96] V. Bergelson, H. Furstenberg, and R. McCutcheon, *IP-sets and polynomial recurrence*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **16** (1996), no. 5, 963–974. MR1417769 (98c:28024) ↑1, 11, 13, 14
- [BHKM06] V. Bergelson, I. J. Håland Knutson, and R. McCutcheon, *IP-systems, generalized polynomials and recurrence*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **26** (2006), no. 4, 999–1019, available at <http://www.math.osu.edu/~bergelson.1/BHaM28dec5.pdf>. MR2246589 (2008d:37001) ↑1, 11, 14
- [BL03] V. Bergelson and A. Leibman, *Topological multiple recurrence for polynomial configurations in nilpotent groups*, Adv. Math. **175** (2003), no. 2, 271–296, available at <http://www.math.osu.edu/~bergelson.1/NilGPHJ.pdf>. MR1972634 (2004d:54036) ↑6, 7, 8
- [BL96] ———, *Polynomial extensions of van der Waerden’s and Szemerédi’s theorems*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1996), no. 3, 725–753, available at <http://www.math.osu.edu/~bergelson.1/PolSz.pdf>. MR1325795 (96j:11013) ↑1
- [BL99] ———, *Set-polynomials and polynomial extension of the Hales-Jewett theorem*, Ann. of Math. (2) **150** (1999), no. 1, 33–75, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/9907201>. MR1715320 (2000h:05226) ↑7, 8, 10
- [BM00] V. Bergelson and R. McCutcheon, *An ergodic IP polynomial Szemerédi theorem*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **146** (2000), no. 695, viii+106, available at <http://www.math.osu.edu/~bergelson.1/bm-memoirfinal16apr99.pdf>. MR1692634 (2000m:28018) ↑1, 2, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24
- [FK85] H. Furstenberg and Y. Katznelson, *An ergodic Szemerédi theorem for IP-systems and combinatorial theory*, J. Analyse Math. **45** (1985), 117–168. MR833409 (87m:28007) ↑1, 12, 14, 26
- [FK91] ———, *A density version of the Hales-Jewett theorem*, J. Anal. Math. **57** (1991), 64–119. MR1191743 (94f:28020) ↑1
- [Fur77] H. Furstenberg, *Ergodic behavior of diagonal measures and a theorem of Szemerédi on arithmetic progressions*, J. Analyse Math. **31** (1977), 204–256. MR0498471 (58 #16583) ↑1
- [Fur81] H. Furstenberg, *Recurrence in ergodic theory and combinatorial number theory*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1981. M. B. Porter Lectures. MR603625 (82j:28010) ↑17
- [FW78] H. Furstenberg and B. Weiss, *Topological dynamics and combinatorial number theory*, J. Analyse Math. **34** (1978), 61–85 (1979). MR531271 (80g:05009) ↑10
- [GT12] B. Green and T. Tao, *The quantitative behaviour of polynomial orbits on nilmanifolds*, Ann. of Math. (2) **175** (2012), no. 2, 465–540, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0709.3562v5>. MR2877065 ↑2
- [GTZ10] B. Green, T. Tao, and T. Ziegler, *An inverse theorem for the Gowers $U^{s+1}[N]$ -norm*, ArXiv e-prints (September 2010), available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1009.3998>. ↑2
- [Hin74] N. Hindman, *Finite sums from sequences within cells of a partition of $\mathbb{N}$* , J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. A **17** (1974), 1–11. MR0349574 (50 #2067) ↑13
- [Lei02] A. Leibman, *Polynomial mappings of groups*, Israel J. Math. **129** (2002), 29–60, available at <http://www.math.osu.edu/~leibman.1/preprints/PolMapG.pdf>. with erratum. MR1910931 (2003g:20060) ↑1, 2, 4, 17
- [Lei98] ———, *Multiple recurrence theorem for measure preserving actions of a nilpotent group*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **8** (1998), no. 5, 853–931, available at <http://www.math.osu.edu/~leibman.1/preprints/NilSz.pdf>. MR1650102 (99k:28019) ↑1
- [McC05] R. McCutcheon, *FVIP systems and multiple recurrence*, Israel J. Math. **146** (2005), 157–188. MR2151599 (2006b:37015) ↑1, 19

- [Mil75] K. R. Milliken, *Ramsey's theorem with sums or unions*, J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. A **18** (1975), 276–290. MR0373906 (51 #10106) ↑13
- [Rot95] J. J. Rotman, *An introduction to the theory of groups*, Fourth, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 148, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. MR1307623 (95m:20001) ↑11
- [Sze75] E. Szemerédi, *On sets of integers containing no k elements in arithmetic progression*, Acta Arith. **27** (1975), 199–245. Collection of articles in memory of Jurii Vladimirovič Linnik. MR0369312 (51 #5547) ↑1
- [Tay76] A. D. Taylor, *A canonical partition relation for finite subsets of ω* , J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. A **21** (1976), no. 2, 137–146. MR0424571 (54 #12530) ↑13

KORTEWEG-DE VRIES INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM, P.O. BOX 94248, 1090 GE AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS

E-mail address: zorin-kranich@uva.nl

URL: <http://staff.science.uva.nl/~pavelz/>